

CONSIDERATIONS  
ON THE  
EXPLICATIONS  
OF THE  
**Doctrine of the Trinity.**

OCCASIONED

By Four Sermons preached by his Grace  
the Lord Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*.

A Sermon preached by the Lord-Bishop of *Worcester*.

A Discourse by the Lord-Bishop of *Salisbury*.

A Sheet by a very Learned Hand, containing Twen-  
ty eight Propositions.

A Treatise by an Eminent *Dissenting Minister*, being  
*A Calm Discourse concerning the Possibility of a Trinity*,

And by a Book in answer to the Animadversions on  
*Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Trinity*.

---

*In a Letter to H. H.*

---

Printed in the Year M. DC. XCIV.

ON THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE



## To Mr. H. H.

S I R,

**T**IS but a little while since I wrote, to a *Person of Quality*, some *Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, by Dr. *Sherlock*, Dr. *Wallis*, Dr. *S—th*, and Others: You write to me hereupon, that if I have by me any such Remarks, on the *Explications or Defences* of that Doctrine, by other Learned Men, I should (by all means) send 'em to you; therefore I here send you the Notes I have made, on a Sermon (by my Lord the Bishop of Worcester) concerning the *Mysteries of the Christian Faith*; on four Sermons by his Grace the Arch-Bishop of

*Canterbury*, concerning the Divinity of our *Blessed Saviour*; on a Discourse by the Bishop of *Salisbury*, of the Divinity and Death of (the Lord) *Christ*; on a Treatise by an Eminent Presbyterian Minister, being a *Calm Inquiry* concerning the Possibility of the Trinity; on a Sheet by a very Learned Hand, being *Twenty eight Propositions*, by which the *Doctrine of the Holy Trinity* is endeavour'd to be Explained; on a Book in answer to the *Animadversions* on Dr. *Sherlock's* Vindication of the Trinity, wherein the Author undertakes further to *Affirm and Explain the Doctrine of the Incarnation*; He is Head of a College, and well known by other Writings.

### *On a Sermon of my Lord the Bishop of Worcester, in Vindication of the Mysteries of the Christian Faith.*

**T**HIS Sermon was preached April 7. 1691. and published shortly after by Mr. *Mortlock*, Bookseller, at the Phenix in St. Paul's Church-Yard: 'Tis on these words of St. Paul, *Jesus Christ sent into the World to save Sinners*, 1 Tim. 1. 15.

As to the Author of this Sermon, his Person and Qualifications; I readily acknowledge, he hath all the Properties, for which an Adversary may be either Feared, or Reverenced. He understands perfectly the Doctrine of the Church; and the Points in Question. He will commit no Oversight thro' Ignorance, Haste, or Inadvertion; He will know how to Take, and to Manage all Advantages. He is too Experienc'd and

Judicious to hazard his Cause, as Others have lately done, on the Success of a *Half-thought Hypothesis*, a *Crude Invention*, a pretty *New Querk*. In a word, we can only say of him; Since there is no Remedy, *Cautus sumus hoc Catone*.

As to the Sermon it self, it consists of a great many Heads; but the *Secrets* of all lies in these three. 1. God may justly require of us, to Believe (on his Word) what we cannot Comprehend. 2. Those who reject the *Mysteries* of Faith, do themselves advance greater Mysteries, than those are, against which they declaim so earnestly. 3. The Manner or Way of Salvation by Christ, which the Church teaches, tends

A 2

more

more to the Benefit and Advantage of Mankind, than the Way of Salvation by Christ, taught by the Socinians.

I may say, of these three Propositions; the First is True, but not to the Purpose. The Second is Home to the Purpose, but not True. The Third is neither True nor to the Purpose.

I begin with the First.

*God may require justly of us, to Believe (on his Word) what we cannot comprehend.*

For my own part, I confess it to be my Opinion, that we converse every Day with very many things, none of which we comprehend. Who is he that comprehends, either the Structure, or the Reason of the Powers of seminal Forms or Seeds? Or how the Parts of Matter hold together? Or how, being in their own Natures *Life-less* and *Sense-less*, they do (for all that) in some Postures and Textures acquire Life, Sensation, and even Volition, Memory and Reason? Or how the Sun and other vast Heavenly Fires subsist for so many Ages, without any Nourishment or Fuel; which Fire, of all other Bodies, most requires? Or how, when the Sun arrives at the Tropics, he never goes further, either Northward or Southward, but returns towards the Equator, and thereby preserves the World by his Vital Warmth?

'Tis said somewhere in this Sermon, that *we comprehend not the least Spirit of Grass*. I acknowledge the Truth of this Saying; I will add to it, That *all the Works of God have upon them his Signature*: that is, they are *Incomprehensible* by Humane Understanding, and *Unimitable* by Humane Art and Industry. If we did comprehend them, we might make most of them, for we have always by us the Materials of which they are made: But all the Chymists, and the whole Royal Society, are not able to make a Barley Corn, or a Grain of Wheat; these simplest and plainest of the Works of God, are *Mysteries* to us, we do not comprehend them, we cannot make them.

Therefore his Lordship might have spe-

red to himself the pains of those Ten Pages in his Sermon, in which he seeks to prove, that there are many things which we do not comprehend; and that several things in Nature, in Art, and in Religion, are *Mysteries* to us. He utterly mistakes, in Thinking, that we deny the Articles of the *New Christianity*, or *Athanasian Religion*, because they are *Mysteries*, or because we do not comprehend them; we deny 'em, *because we do comprehend them*; we have a clear and distinct Perception, that they are not *Mysteries*, but Contradictions, Impossibilities, and pure Non-senses. We have our Reason in vain, and all Science and Certainty would be destroyed; if we could not distinguish, between *Mysteries* and *Contradictions*; which are (by all confessed to be) *Impossibilities*. But because some have learned to call their Non-sense, the *Deep Things of God*; and their Contradictions, *Mysteries of Religion*: therefore a Learned Person was persuaded by some of our Friends, to write an Account of the Word *Mystery*, as 'tis taken in Holy Scripture. He meant not to say, there are no Mysteries in Nature, in Religion, or in Art; all he intended was this: "Tho' there are in Religion some *Mysteries* and *Incomprehensible Secrets*; yet we are not to give the Venerable Name of *Mystery*, to Doctrines that are contrary to *Nature's* and *Reason's* Light, or which destroy and contradict our *Natural Ideas*; the Holy Scriptures call not such things, *Mysteries*. So far from that, that the ordinary meaning of *Mystery* in Scripture, is not *something in its own Nature obscure and dark*; but only some either Doctrine or Manifestation of God's Will, which in its own Nature is *Intelligible* and agreeable to Reason, but was kept secret (or was made a *Mystery* or Secret) to past Ages; and was revealed in Gospel-Times by the Lord Christ and his Apostles.

In a word, whereas 'in too common among us, to vend *Imposture* and *Contradictions*, under the pretence and name of *Mysteries*; this Author seeketh not such *Mysteries*,

riety, and least of all in Religion: And he hath discoursed so successfully against 'em, that the *Mirchants of these Wares* are (and have reason to be) very angry with him, because their Market is much hindered by what he hath said.

Whether what they call *Mysteries*, are *Real Mysteries*, or *Real Contradictions*, hath been argued in the *Notes on the Creed of Athanasius*; in the *Trinitarian Scheme of Religion*; the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*; and divers others Books published very lately by the Unitarians: And the Unitarians are willing to leave their Cause upon that Issue, if their Opposers agree to it. The most Learned Prelate, the Author of this Sermon, has offer'd nothing in answer to those Prints, but only tells us here, that *we must Believe some Mysteries*, which we grant: and that we advance as great Paradoxes, as any we oppose; which I will examine in due place.

Having granted to his Lordship his first Point, That we may be obliged by God, to believe what we do not comprehend; and having shewn, that the Concession doth not hurt the Unitarians; I might now pass to his second Proposition: But the Heat of Writing and Controversy, having so far transported his Lordship, that to prove what he expected would be denied, he hath alledged for Instances of *Mystery*, such things as are not indeed Mysteries, but either plain Errors, or evident Contradictions: therefore I will bestow some farther Reflections on this part of his Sermon.

He saith at P. 16. "There is no greater Difficulty, in the Conception of a Trinity, or the Incarnation, than there is in the Conception of Eternity."

Now, what and how many are the Contradictions of the (pretended) Trinity and Incarnation, hath been (partly) shewn in the *Brief Notes on the Creed of Athanasius*; and in the *Trinitarian Scheme of Religion*: Let us see what Contradictions he findeth in the Conception of Eternity.

First, He dares not call them Contradictions

(tho as he states them, they are undeniable Contradictions) but *Difficulties*; because if they were confessed to be Contradictions, he would be forced to deny an Eternity.

Well, but whether Contradictions, or only Difficulties; what are they? He answers at P. 17. "If God was for ever, (or was from Eternity) he must be from himself. But what Notion or Conception can we have in our Minds of such a thing? I answer; to say a Person or Thing was from it self, is a Contradiction; it implies this Contradiction, *It was, before it was.*"

But, he saith, if God was from all Eternity, he must be from himself. I am sorry, an Eternal God must be a Contradiction. Had he no way to defend the *New Mysteries*, but by espousing the Cause of the Atheists? For my part, I shall rather grant to him, that there is no Contradiction in the Trinity, than that an Eternal God is a Contradiction.

But what makes him say, God must be from Himself, or Self-originated? Neither the Creeds, nor Fathers, whom he is bound to follow, so speak. They say, God is of *None*; that is, neither from Himself, nor from any Other; and he is not Self-originated, but *Unoriginated*.

He saith, If God is from Eternity, he MUST be from Himself. By no means, the contrary Illation is True, and (I think) Self-evident. If God is from Eternity, He must be of *None*; neither of (or from) Himself, nor from any other. Not from Himself, for then he must be before he was: and neither from Himself, nor from any other; because, *all Origination, of what kind soever, is inconsistent with an Eternal Being.*

His Lordship goes on, at P. 18. "Let these Men try their Imaginations about God's Eternity. — How should God Co-exist with all the Differences of Time, and yet there be no Succession in his Being. — For where there is Succession, there is a passing out of not being in such a Duration, into being in it: which is not consistent with

"with the Absolute Perfection of the Divine Nature. From whence, Eternity was defined by *Borthius*, a Perfect and Complete Possession of Eternal Life *all at once*. But how can we form any Conception in our Minds, of that being *all at once*; which hath such different Acts, as must be measured by a long Succession of Time? As Creating, and Dissolving the World; Promising, and sending the Messiah; how can these consist with a Permanent Instant, or a Continuance of Being without Succession?

I shall confess to you, Sir, that such an Eternity as this, is a *Mystery* and a *Difficulty*, with a Witness. It was first broached by the Platonists; from them borrowed by *Borthius*; and by the Schoolmen handed down to the Doctors and Professors of Mysteries, in our Times. I do not say, it is a Contradiction; 'tis a great many Contradictions. His Lordship bids us try our Imaginations upon it: I pray his Lordship, first to try his Imagination upon these Queries about it.

1. What is the difference between an *Eternal Moment*, which every one discerns is a Contradiction in the very Terms; and between Possessing Eternal Life *all at once*, which is his Lordship's Definition of Eternity? I appeal to the Understandings and Consciences, of all Sensible and Unprejudiced Men, whether they are not the same?

2. Seeing it is of the Nature of all Duration, to consist in a Succession; else it were not Duration, but a Moment: I ask, whether it be not Unavoidable, that if Almighty God possesses Eternal Life *all at once*, he must have passed into some Durations before they are? The Duration, for Example, in which the Day of the Last Judgment shall be, is not yet actually come: But if God possesses Eternity *all at once*, he is already entered upon that Duration; that is, he is entered upon it before it is. But that is a Contradiction. That a thing should be possessed before it is, implies this Contradiction, *It is before it is*; for unless

it is, it cannot be possessed.

3. Seeing 'tis a Contradiction, and therefore impossible, that any Being should possess a Duration before such Duration is; I desire to know of his Lordship, How it can be an Imperfection (as he affirms) in the Divine Nature, not to do that which implies a Contradiction, and is impossible to be done? For hitherto these Men have taught us, that to do Contradictions, would not be a Perfection, but an Imperfection in the Divine Nature?

4. How is it more an Imperfection, as his Lordship says; to pass from not being in such a particular Duration, to being in it; than 'tis an Imperfection, to pass from not Operating in such a Duration, to Operating in it? This last, all Men must confess to be true of God; for none will dare to say, God made all his Works at once; tho' his Lordship is pleased here to say, what is much more impossible, that he possesses his whole Eternity at once.

5. What Shadow of Imperfection is it, to pass from one Duration to another; when the Person so passing, carries with him all Perfections into every Duration?

When his Lordship shall have satisfied these Questions, I will begin to think, he has found a justifiable Parallel for his (pretended) Trinity. But the Notion of the Trinity, and this Notion of Eternity, will be vindicated both in a Day.

At P. 20. he saith; "Some of these Men who cry down Mysteries, and magnify Reason, to show how slender their Pretences to Reason are, have asserted a Corporal God, with Shape and Figure.—But how to reconcile the Notion of a Body, with Infinite Perfections, is a Mystery to me."  
"But some Men may confound Finite and Infinite, Body and Spirit, God and Man; and yet are for no Mysteries."

Now, I know but one Unitarian Writer, who ever asserted a Corporal God, with Shape and Figure: But when his Lordship pleases to demand it, I will cite the express Words

of

of several of the Fathers (and they, I hope, were not Unitarians) who were in this sentiment. But he had no reason at all to object this to the present Unitarians, who have so lately asserted and vindicated, both the Infinity of God's Perfections, and his *Real* Omnipresence, against Dr. Sherlock.

He saith, P. 21. "If we believe Prophecy, we must believe God's Fore-knowledge of Future Events.—Is there no Mystery in this; nothing above their Comprehension? Well, what if there be; will he prove it is a Contradiction? Yea, 'tis a Contradiction, according as he has stated it; for he saith: "Nothing can be Fore-known, but what has a *certain* Cause: and therefore if *Evil Actions* be Fore-told, "Men will not be *Free Agents* in them, but "God must be the Cause of them.

I answer, If nothing can be Fore-known, that proceeds from *Free Agents*; I grant 'tis a Contradiction that God should foresee the *Evil Actions* of Men, who (most certainly) are *free* both in the Good and Evil Actions that they do. But 'tis utterly false, that what proceeds from *Free Agents*, cannot be Foreknown or Foretold: That the Wills of Men are free, doth not annul the Certainty or Possibility of Prophecy; because the Infinite Wisdom of God doth foresee, what our Wills, tho' free, will chuse.

A thing is not *necessary*, as is supposed in this Objection, because God doth *certainly* foresee it, or foresee it as *certain*: for there may be a *Certainty of Futurity*, without a *Necessity of Futurity*.

Every *Free Agent* shall *certainly* do, whatever it will do; but he will do it *freely*, and not *necessarily*. So that it implies no Contradiction, no nor Difficulty; that God by his Infinite Wisdom should *certainly* foreknow those *Evil Actions*, which shall *not necessarily* (but certainly and freely) come to pass: He foreseeing them in *Free Agents*, who indeed will *certainly* so Act; not in Agents that must *necessarily* so Act.

I think this to be clear; and 'tis generally confessed, by the more Learned of all Per-

suasions. But if it were not, were I in his Lordship's Station, I would forbear to oppose the Unity of God from such Topics as these: If there be no way to attack the Doctrine of the Unity of God, but by finding Contradictions in his Eternity and Fore-knowledge, the chief Attributes by which he is God; it were better, to leave that Envidious Doctrine, in whatsoever Reputation it has, or shall, gain.

He saith, P. 22. "I desire to know, whether they believe the Attributes of God to be Finite, or Infinite?—If they are Infinite, How can we comprehend them? We are strangely puzzled in plain ordinary Finite Things; but 'tis Madness to pretend, to comprehend what is Infinite.

That the Attributes of God are Incomprehensible, I have often heard; but never till now, what his Lordship adds in the next place, purely from himself: "If nothing, saith he, is to be believed, but what may be comprehended, the very Being of God must be rejected too.

To comprehend the Being or Existence of God, is only this, to comprehend that God is: and if we cannot comprehend that, all Religion ceases.

But I confess, that neither do I understand it, why his Lordship and many Others are so positive, that we cannot comprehend an Infinite Attribute, or Attributes. Let us consider, what 'tis to comprehend a Thing; 'tis to have a clear, distinct, and adequate Conception of it. But may we not have such a Notion of an Infinite Attribute? I think, we may. *Eternity* is an Infinite Attribute and Perfection of the Divine Nature; so are God's Infinite *Power*, *Wisdom*, and *Justice*: Of all these we may have a clear, distinct and adequate Conception. For what is God's *Eternity*, but that Duration by which he is without all Beginning, and End? I appeal to all Men, and to his Lordship, out of the Heats of Dispute; Whether this Conception be not Clear, Distinct, and Adequate? Infinite *Wisdom* and *Power* are those Properties, by which God knows and can do,



do, whatsoever implies not a Contradiction to be known and done. His Infinite Justice is his (Indefectible) Propensity to do to all Persons, and at all Times, according to what is Right and Equal; except where, and when, his Wisdom and Goodness sees fit to abate of his own Right, and to show Mercy. They may wrangle as long as they please, but it will be evident to all indifferent and unprejudiced Men, that these Conceptions are distinct and clear, and adequate also to the Properties that are their Objects.

But they say, How can a Finite Mind comprehend what is Infinite? I answer, 1. 'Tis plain by what hath been said, that so the thing is. 2. The (Intellectual) Comprehension of a Finite Mind, may be, and actually is, in some respects Infinite: Because what is Finite with respect to its *Extension of Parts*, may be Infinite in other regards, or with respect to some of its *Powers*. Thus the Mind of Man hath not only, in some respects, an Infinite (Intellectual) Capacity or Comprehension, but it hath another Infinite Property, even Infinite or Eternal Duration, which we call its Immortality; and which is a Power no less admirable, than its Infinite Comprehension. A Body, suppose, of an Inch square, is not only not Infinite in Extension, but is a very small Body: Yet it hath this Infinite Power, to be *Divisible to Infinity*.

But hitherto in answer to his Lordship's first Head or Proposition, that *God may oblige us to believe, on his Word, what we understand not*. I have granted it so to be; but have been forced to observe, that the Instances by which he would confirm it, are unluckily chosen: for they are either plain Errors, or evident Contradictions.

On his Second Proposition.

The second principal Head in this Sermon, is this: "As much as they (the Unitarians) are afraid of Mysteries; themselves advance greater Mysteries, and things more incomprehensible, than the

"Trinity or Incarnation, or any other taught by the Church.

I confess, I thought hitherto, that the whole Pretence of these Men, had been only this, to free Religion from all Uncouth, Odd, and Absurd Notions, to make it easy, intelligible, and rational; in a word, to restore it to its Primitive Plainness and Truth. But his Lordship tells me News; It is, he saith, no such thing; they are a Company of obstinate and perverse Fellows, that Bark continually at Mysteries and Contradictions, while themselves are much more guilty of the whole Charge, than any sort of Men under the Sun. All that I can say to this, Sir, is, That if it be so, there are few Men that are more able to prove, and to expose their Perverseness and Folly, than the Author of this Sermon: And if he fails in the Attempt, it may be presumed by All, that the Accusation is Groundless, Disingenuous, and Ungrateful. He finds Six Mysteries in their Explication of Religion: Which are, he saith, greater and more incomprehensible, than we can pretend to find any in the Doctrine of the Church. Let us consider them severally.

1. (P. 24.) "They make Mysteries of Plain and Easy Things: For they suppose *John* the Evangelist, in the beginning of his Gospel, goes about, in profound and lofty Expressions, to prove a thing, which was never disputed by any, viz. That altho Christ was born six Months after John Baptist, yet he was before him in Dignity. This is a Mystery which (as I remember) *Faustus Socinus* gloried, that his Uncle *Lellius* obtained by Revelation.

Now I remember no such thing, and I am well assured, that his Lordship cannot direct us to the Place in *Socinus* his Works, where this may be found. *Faustus Socinus* doth not say, that his Uncle *Lellius* had any Revelation, concerning the meaning of any Expression (or Expressions) in the beginning of *St. John's Gospel*; nor concerning any other Text or Passage of Holy Scripture. But whereas *Erasmus Johannus* had said,

said, that the Socinian Interpretation of these Words of our Saviour, *Before Abraham was I am*, was very intricate and harsh: *Faustus Socinus* answers, that it is the Interpretation which had been thought of first by his Uncle *Laelius*; and I, *said he*, have cause to think, that *Laelius* obtained it from the Lord Christ, by his Prayers: *Non levis habeo Conjecturas, illum (nempè Laelium) eam Interpretationem precibus multis ab ipso Christo impetrasse*. In short, *Faustus* neither says, that his Uncle had any Revelation concerning any Passage in the Beginning of *St. John's Gospel*; as his Lordship here pretends; nor doth he so much as say, that his Uncle ever pretended to any Revelation at all: but only that he *thinks*, or he *conjectures*, that such a dextrous and admirable Interpretation, was an Effect of his Uncle's Prayers, rather than of his Studies and Consideration. That is, *Faustus Socinus* was so much a Christian, as to ascribe to our Lord Christ the Glory and Praise of that great Light which his Uncle *Laelius* had given to a very obscure Context of Scripture, rather than to his Uncle's Wit or Learning.

But now, what if it were true, that *Faustus Socinus* had said, That his Uncle *Laelius* had obtained that Explication, by Revelation; was this a Matter to be placed in the Fore-front of the great Mysteries, that his Lordship had to charge on the Unitarian Doctrine? Methinks, he might better have called it a *Trist*, than a *Mystery*. They suppose, *said he*, that the Evangelist, in profound Language and lofty Expressions, goes about to prove, that Jesus Christ was in Dignity, before *John* the Baptist.

But, (1.) I cannot find that profound Language, and those lofty Expressions, in this Evangelist. The Sense indeed is sometimes profound, or if you will, *lofty*; but the Language or Expression is always *mean*. The Observation of *Orator*, on the Language of *St. John*, is very different from that of his Lordship. *Magis* (saith he, *Pref. ad Evangel. S. Jo.*) *is* *simpliciter dictum simpliciter*.

(2.) If the Language were indeed profound,

and the Expression *lofty*; it would not follow, therefore the Sense that is intended, must be a *Mystery*. The Language and Expressions of the Prophet *Isaiah*, are profound and *lofty*; he hath an Elevation both of *Conceit* and *Expression*, above any of the Greek or Roman, whosoer Orators or Poets: and yet the Sense couched in his Expressions, is seldom any thing like a *Mystery*; sometimes 'tis only this, *such a Place shall be desolate, or there shall happen a great War, or there shall be a happy Peace*. (3.) But in very deed, is this the *Mystery* that the Unitarians find in the Proem or Beginning of *St. John's Gospel*, that *Christ Jesus was in Dignity and Office*, above *St. John Baptist*? I had thought, the *Mystery* with which *Socinus* has so much offended some Men, in his Explication of this Context, had been this. "Is the beginning of the Gospel was this Word; that is, the Lord Christ: who being the Bringer or Messenger of God's Will or Word, is therefore called the Word; as, in this very Chapter he is also called *Life* and *Light*, because he brought to Men the Gospel-Light, and the Means of Life eternal. And the Word was with God; that is, the Lord Christ was taken up into Heaven, to be instructed in all Points, relating to his Ambassage or Ministry. And the Word was God; in the Greek 'tis, was a God: that is, it pleased God to communicate to the Lord Christ, who is the Mediator or Bringer of the New Testament, that Name about every Name, even the Name or Appellation of God; as he had formerly done to *Moses*, the Mediator of the Old Testament; and to divers others; *Exod. 3. 1. Ps. 45. 6. 1. 2. and 82. 6. John 10. 34. 35. 1 Sam. 28. 11. 12. 13. 14.* By him were all things made; that is, all things relating to the New Creation were made (or were effected) by him. The Word was Made by him; in the Greek, was *shaped* by him: that is, he reduced all things to a New and Better Estate; by his abolishing Paganism, and Judaism; and introducing the Gospel-Oeconomy

B

"and

"and since. This is the great mystery, if it must needs be so called, that *Verbum* discovered in this Context: and the Author of this Sermon doth in the very next Page to this, reckon some part of this (before-mentioned) Interpretation, among his Mysteries; though here he grievously complains, that we God so Mysteries is the *profane Language* and *lusty Expressions* of St. John in this beginning of his Gospel. (4.) As to that, *Christ Jesus was, in Dignity and Office, before (or above) John the Baptist*; 'tis indeed also said in this Context: but are the Unitarians the only Men, that make this Sense of these Words of St. John, *He that came after me is preferred before me, for he was before me*? Was John as is interpreted of Priority of Dignity and Excellence, not of Priority of Time; by the principal Critics among the Trinitarians themselves, particularly by Erasmus and Beza. Those Critics saw, that the Greek words *αυτος, ος εστιν*, should not be rendered by *Prior in time* (he was before me), but by *Prior in status*; he was more excellent.

2. The next Mystery, charged here on the Unitarians, is; that they say, the Attribution of God, even his *Wisdom* or *Power*, was made *Flesh*. This, said his Lordship, is a Mystery beyond all Comprehension; 'tis to say, an *Accidens* was made a *Substantia*.

It seems, his Lordship has taken notice, that the Author of the *Dr. History of the Unitarians* interprets the Word in the beginning of St. John's Gospel, to be the *Power* and *Wisdom* of God: I think this to be very defensible, and probably, though the Unitarians more commonly, by the Word understand the Person of our Saviour, or the *Man Christ Jesus*. When the Evangelist saith, *the Word was made Flesh*: how doth his Lordship, and his Party, understand it? Why, thus; the Word, or God the Son was incarnate, he Abode or Tabernacled in *Flesh*, that is in Man, in the Man Christ Jesus: and so in Appearance, and in a Sense was made *Flesh*, or made Man. The Unitarians think, it implies many Contradictions; that God himself (in his own Person) should be incarnate;

or by Tabernacled in *Flesh*, be (as it were) made Man; and so much, they have evinced in divers (late) Tracts by them published; of which their Opposers have not yet thought fit, to seem to know any thing. Therefore by the Word, we do not understand God the Son; the rather, because no such Person is once mentioned in all R. Scripture: but the *Power* or *Wisdom* of God; which none can deny is very frequently called the Word, in the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testaments. We say, this Word (or this Power and Wisdom of God) was made *Flesh*, or Man; because an Inspired Writer hath expressly so taught us: but we do not mean hereby, as his Lordship would insinuate, that the Wisdom or Power of God was turned into *Flesh*, or into a Man. But we mean, as the Trinitarians themselves also mean, that the Word was incarnate, Tabernacled in *Flesh*, Abode on the Man Christ Jesus, in more ample Manner, and much larger Measure, than on former Prophets. All which amounts to no more, than what is said at Acts 10. 38. *God anointed Jesus of Nazareth, with the Holy Ghost, and with Power*.

I appeal to you, Sir, or to any indifferent Man, what Mystery there is in this? Be sure, it seemed no Mystery to the most learned and judicious *Gratians*; whose Interpretation it is, and from him taken by the Author of the *Dr. History of the Unitarians*.

3. In the next place, he finds fault, that the Unitarians should rather choose to say, that the Lord Christ was taken up into Heaven before he entered on his Ministry, to be there perfectly instructed in the Will of God concerning the Gospel Dispensation: than to say, that God the Son came down from Heaven, and was incarnate. I cannot for my Life discern, why he should reckon this among the *Mysteries* or *Difficult* things. I omit, that it is not the Doctrine of all the Unitarians, as may be seen in the *Brit. History*; where another Account is given of the Text, that speak of Christ's being with God, coming down from Abodes, coming forth from God.

God. Suppose it were the more general Doctrine of the Unitarians, yet how is it more mysterious, or more difficult to be understood, than St. Paul's being caught up into the Third Heaven, to hear Words, which 'tis not lawful for a Man to utter? As is said, 2 Cor. 12. 4.

Me thinks, the *Mystery* is wholly on his Lordship's side. For how can we conceive, that God (as his Lordship affirms) came down from Heaven? To Descend or Ascend, belongs only to Limited and Finite Beings: an Infinite Person can neither ascend, nor come down. I with his Lordship would clear to us this *Mystery*.

4. But it must, he thinks, be acknowledged to be a *Mystery*; that a Man should become God, or a God. He findeth a great many Repugnancies, in this; 'tis as much as to say "a Created God, an Eternal Son of Adam, Omnipotent Infirmary, an Infinite finite Being.

These are Repugnancies indeed; but do the Unitarians make such a God of the Lord Christ? His Lordship, it seems, found it necessary to mis-report their Doctrine; before he could find *Mysteries* in it. This agrees very well with the Artifice of an Orator; but not so well, with the Simplicity of a Divine.

The Appellation God being given, in H. Scripture, to Moses, Exod. 7. 1. to the Magistrates of Israel, Ps. 82. 1, 6. John 10. 35. to Solomon, Ps. 45. 6. to Angels, Ps. 97. 7. because of the Authority and Power given to them; and the Lord Christ having all Power given to him, both in Heaven and in Earth, Matth. 28. 18. that is, as St. Peter hath interpreted, Angels, Authorities and Powers being made subject to him, 1 Pet. 3. 22. therefore the Unitarians have been willing to grant, that the Lord Christ may be called a God. They doubt not, that as God hath thus highly exalted him, hath given him a better Right to that Name above every Name, than Moses or Solomon, or even Angels have; so he hath also qualified him, with suitable Abilities; that is, with Abilities to manage

his universal Empire, his Kingdom over Angels, and the Church. But he neither hath, nor can give to him, his own Divine Nature; or the incommunicable Properties of the Deity, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, Omniscience, and such like. In a word; we Ascribe so much, and no more either Authority or Ability to the Lord Christ, than the Trinitarians themselves attribute to his meer Humane Nature, in his present State of Exaltation, as Divines have called it. Saving that we think, his high Qualifications and Exaltation is sufficient to invite him, to the Appellation God, or a God. And some of our Number think, he may be invoked in Prayer: not because he is Omnipotent, or Omnipresent; but because he pleased God to reveal to him (Revel. 1. 1.) our Prayers, he being by Office our Mediator. But to prevent Mistakes among the Ignorant, the Unitarians think it were better, to use the words Christ, Lord, and Saviour, when we speak of the Lord Jesus; than to call him God, or a God. The former are often, and undeniably used of him, in Holy Scripture: but it cannot be satisfactorily proved, that any Authentic Copies of the Bible do give to him the title God; as the Author of the *Brief History* hath abundantly shown.

This is what the Unitarians believe, and teach concerning this Matter: let his Lordship shew, what *Mystery*, or what Difficulty, it implies. He talks of Repugnancies in their Doctrine; but he is forced to misrepresent it, before he could find the least Shadow of a Repugnancy.

5. Next, he attacks the Unitarian Doctrine about the (pretended) Satisfaction, I must crave leave to say here, his Lordship seems not to understand the true Sense of this Question. He saith, P. 26. "Tis more reasonable to believe, that Jesus Christ suffered for our Sakes, than for his own. But 'tis, I think, granted on all Hands, that he suffered for both. For his own sake, on a double Account: First, in that for this Joy that was set before him (1. 2.

to obtain the Glorious and Eternal Rewards of cheerful suffering in the Cause, and for the Glory of God) *he endured the Cross, and despised the Shame*, Heb. 12. 2. Secondly, Because it became him, *for whom are all things, and by whom are all things*, (that is to say, God) *is bringing many Sons to Glory*, to make the Captain of our Salvation, even the Lord Christ, perfect through Sufferings, Heb. 2. 10. Then, for our sakes, on many Accounts; this, for one. Effectually to recommend Mankind to the Mercy, Forgiveness, and Favour of God, on the Conditions of Faith, and Works of Life, on our parts.

*Ibid.* "We say, Christ made himself a voluntary Sacrifice, for the Expiation of the Sins of Men.—But others deny this, and make him to suffer, as one wholly Innocent. I demand, for what Reason?"

But the Unitarians never denied, as his Lordship here fancies, that Jesus Christ made himself a voluntary Sacrifice, for Expiation of the Sins of Mankind. They ever acknowledged, that the Lord Christ was an Expiatory Sacrifice for our Sins, as may be seen in the Sacrobian Catechism, in the Epistles of Schleiermacher, and of (the Excellent) Ruusbroeck; as also in all our (late) Prints in the English Tongue. What we deny, is this; that this Sacrifice was by way of true and proper Satisfaction, or full and adequate Payment to the Justice of God: We say, this Sacrifice (as all other Sacrifices) was only an Oblation or Application to the Mercy of God; a Sacrifice it was, which it pleased God to accept for us, tho he might have refused it. And for this Reason 'tis said all along in Holy Scripture, that God forgives to us our Sins; and not that he received a Satisfaction, or an Equivalent for them.

Whereas his Lordship adds; that the Unitarians make the Lord Christ to have suffered, as one wholly innocent; and demands thereupon, For what Cause then did he suffer? 'Tis confessed to be one of our (damnable) Heresies, That the Lord Christ was a Person wholly Innocent: And

we hope, that by the Grace of God, we shall be able to defend that Belief concerning our Redeemer, against his Lordship and his Party.

But then, saith he, For what Cause did he suffer? I have answered before, for his own Sake, and for Ours. For ours, that he might recommend us, to the Mercy and Forgiveness of God: For his own, that he might be made Perfect by Suffering (as well as by Doing) the Will of God; and to obtain the Joys set before him, as the Reward of so suffering.

In all this, I think, there is no Mystery; and we are arrived safe at his sixth and last Exception.

6. P. 26. "It is more reasonable to suppose such a Condescension in the Son of God, as to take upon him the Form of a Servant, for our Sakes; than that a meer Man should be exalted to the Honour and Worship, which belongs only to God.—P. 27. This last is an Incomprehensible Mystery, far beyond all that is implied in the Mysteries of the Trinity, or Incarnation.—It subverts the very Design of Christianity; namely, the Reforming of Idolatry: and it lays a Foundation for introducing it again into the World.

He saith, 'Tis more reasonable to suppose, that God should take on him the Form of a Servant; than that a Man should be exalted, as the Unitarians suppose, to the Honour and Worship, which belongs to God only. Methinks, neither of these is reasonable, the former no more than the latter. That God should take on him, the Form of a Servant, as Trinitarians affirm, is as absurd, and derogatory to his Honour, as to give to a Servant, the Honour and Worship due to God.

No, saith his Lordship, for the first "constrains nothing, but what is agreeable to the Divine Nature; even infinite Love, Condescension, and Pity of Mankind. As if God could not Love, Pity, and Deliver Mankind, without taking on himself the Form of a Servant.

His



His Lordship doth not hold such a *Vindictive Justice*, in God, that he could not pardon Mankind without a *Satisfaction*: and if not, methinks 'tis more reasonable to suppose with the Unitarians, that God hath admitted us to Conditions of Pardon and Favour, for his own Mercy's Sake, and in Contemplation of the Unblemish'd Life, and voluntary Sufferings and Sacrifice of Christ Jesus; than to suppose with his Lordship, and his Party, that God himself took on him the Form of a *Servant*, and suffered in our steads, to reconcile us to himself. This last is, without doubt, an Incomprehensible Mystery, that God should rather chuse to suffer for us himself, than to forgive us. His Lordship, and his Party, could never have persuaded the belief of such a Paradox, if Men were left to chuse their Opinions, by their agreeableness, to Reason or to Scripture. God himself, say they, took on him the Form of a *Servant*; and suffered, in our steads, to reconcile us to himself: and thus they call a *Satisfaction to his Justice*. But why do they not see, that if I pay to my self the Debt of my Debtor, or undergo the Punishment of my Offender, to satisfy for the Wrong done to my self; this is but a *Mock-Satisfaction*; and I indeed forgive him without a *Satisfaction*? By such a Satisfaction, as they have conceived, Justice is not Answered or Appeased, but Abus'd and Mocked. My Advice to 'em is, that when they exhibit such Ridiculous Scenes, as beget Laughter or Contempt in considering Men; they would forbear to make the Majesty of God an Actor or Party in them. But the Church sets us down, what we must believe, on pain of being excluded from the Common Rights of *Men and Christians*: And after this, 'tis no wonder, if the greater part of Mankind make themselves believe, agreeably to their dearest Interests. 'Tis natural to Worldlings, to Mercenary Spirits, to the Timorous and the Ambitious: in a word, to all such as prefer not God before all other, whether Persons or Considerations; to believe as they would have it.

As to giving God's Worship and Honour, or proper Divine Worship to a Creature, to the Man Christ Jesus; which his Lordship so often charges on the Unitarians: He might as well have accused 'em of Sodomy, or Witchcraft. They pay to the Lord Christ no other Honour or Adoration, whether by Body or in Mind, than the Trinitarians themselves render to his meer Humane Nature, in his present State of Exaltation: saving that, as was said before, some of 'em think, he may be invocated in Prayer, because God reveals to him our Desires and Wants, on the Account that he is our appointed (and thoroughly-furnish'd) Mediator. If this is a Mistake, 'tis simple Error, not *Mystery*, much less *Idolatry*: For they do not pray to the Lord Christ, as the Fountain of Power and Help; but as the Mediator King, whom God hath set over us, to hear us and to assist us, by the Power he hath from God.

He saith, P. 27. "A God by Office, who is not so by Nature, is a New and Incomprehensible Mystery: And St. Paul blames the Heathens, for doing Service to them which by Nature are not Gods, Gal. 4. 8."

But when God himself says to Moses, I have made thee a God to Pharaoh, Exod. 7. 1. when 'tis said of Solomon, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever, Psal. 45. 6. when God saith to the Judges and Magistracy of Israel, God standeth in the Congregation of the Mighty; he judgeth among the Gods: and again, I have said, Ye are Gods, Psal. 82. 1, 6. when 'tis said to the Angels, Worship him all ye Gods, Ps. 97. 7. when our Saviour saith concerning the Magistracy, He called them Gods, to whom the Word of God came, John 10. 35. I would gladly know of his Lordship, whether these Persons were Gods by Nature, or only Gods by Office; which he saith is a New and Incomprehensible Mystery. 'Tis as Old, we see, as the Books of H. Scripture: and for being Incomprehensible or a Mystery, that we cannot help; 'tis the Language of Scripture, tho' his Lordship is not pleased to like it. But I would know also, why, seeing our Lord

Lord Christ is over all these Gods, he may not in this Sense ( of Office, and Representation ) be called, not only God, but *God of Gods, and God over All* : I see no *Apology* in it: but I readily acknowledge, there may be no small Inconvenience with respect to the Vulgar, who will be apt to misunderstand the Intention of those who so speak. And therefore the Unitarians rather choose to use the Scripture-Words and Phrases, such as *Saviour, Lord, and Christ, than God.*

But he saith, *St. Paul* blames them, who do *Service to such as by Nature are not Gods.* But what Service? Was it not such Service as belonged not to them, either by God's Appointment, or by the Office they had? If themselves had not set up these Gods, but God himself had set them up, and given to them the *Names* every Name, which the same *St. Paul* saith, he hath given to the Lord Christ: if they had not mistook in the Kind, nor exceeded in the Degree, of that Service they did to them, they should not have been blamed.

I have been longer than I designed, on these two Heads; I will make you Amends, Sir, by my Brevity on what remains to be considered.

#### On his Third Proposition.

He saith, last of all; "The Way or Manner of saving Sinners by the Lord Christ, which is taught by the Church, is more for the Benefit and Advantage of Mankind, than the other way is. I said of this Proposition, that 'tis neither true, nor so the purpose.

1. 'Tis not to the Purpose. For the Question is not, What is most for our Advan-

tage, but what is True? It were, for Example, unquestionably more for our Advantage, if it pleased God to give to us that *Imperability*, which the Saints in Heaven now have; than to leave us to the arbitrary choice of our own Wills, and thereby to a possibility of Sinning, and of Damnation.

2. 'Tis as little True, as 'tis to the Purpose. For, how is the Way of Salvation by Christ, which the Church teaches, more for our Advantage, than the Way of Salvation by Christ, taught by the Socinians; when the Conditions to be performed on our parts, are confess'd to be the same, in both the Hypotheses or Ways? It matters not, in point of our Advantage, whether the Lord Christ satisfied the Justice of God on our behalf, or whether he prevailed as the Mercy of God for us: if either way we are assured, and that from God himself, that we are admitted to most Reasonable and Easy Conditions of Pardon and Favour, namely the Conditions of Faith, and *Newness of Life*. I think, Sir, these things are so clear, that I need not trouble you or my self, to make Observations on the many Exceptionable Passages with which the last Pages of this Sermon are filled. And whereas his Lordship, in the beginning of this Sermon, hath cited several Texts, to prove that Jesus Christ is the most High God, and God by Nature; because he hath only cited them, without enlarging or Criticizing on them, I refer my self to the Explications and Answers, in the *Brief History of the Unitarians*, and in the *Answer to Mr. Milbourn*, and our other (last) Pieces.

*On a Discourse of my Lord the Bishop of Sarum, concerning  
the Divinity and Death of (the Lord) Christ.*

**T**HIS is the *Second* Discourse, of Four that are directed by his Lordship, to the Clergy of his Diocese; and is published by Mr. Chiswell, this present Year 1694.

We should be guilty of an Unjustice toward his Lordship, if we did not confess, that these Discourses are very Elegant, and that there are in them divers Raised Thoughts. In short, they are not only worthy of Praise, and Consideration, but they serve also to encrease that Reputation and Esteem, as great as it is, which this Author has merited, by some former Works of a greater Bulk. Furthermore, the Socinians, and all other fault and envied Parties of Christians, are in his Debt, for Owning and Espousing publicly, divers such Truths, as Others perhaps see as well as he, but have not Sincerity, nor Generosity enough, to avow them. Such, for Instance, are these, on which he insists, from P. 185. That every Man has as much Right and Cause to judge of Doctrines and Interpretations, by his *own* Understanding, not by other Mens, as he has to judge of Colours and Proportions by his *own* Eyes, not by the Eyes of Others. That a Man using his own Judgment of Discretion, without Pride, or Affectation of Singularity, to search out the Truth of Doctrines and Opinions, is therein doing the Best thing that he can do; and the most worthy of that Reasonable Nature that God has given to him. That if such Person shall happen to mistake, in the choice of his Opinions, Sect or Way; what or how greatsoever his Mistake may be, 'tis simple Error, not Heresy: for Heresy is Heresy, when a Man advances or follows an Opinion, or Opinions, whether True or False, because

he is led thereto by Interest, Ambition, a Spirit of Wrangling and Contention, or such-like. That 'tis not Error, or Mens following (with Sincerity) the Dictates of their Consciences and Understandings, that has caused Disturbances, and broke the Peace and Order of the Civil Government, and of the Church; but the Spirit of *Lapsing* upon Others, so commonly (and almost universally) found in *Presiding Patents*: The Erroneous, as the stronger Side think they may call them, would have been quiet, if they were not made to apprehend *Inquisitions*, or other Miseries and ill Usage, on the account of their Opinions and Doctrines. But when they have Cause given 'em to fear bad Treatment, for a bare Dissent in an Article of Faith; the Natural and most just Principle of *Self-preservation* obliges 'em to combine together for their necessary Defence: And from hence have arisen all the Contentions, which have so violently shaken Churches and Kingdoms.

These are Truths, as Generous, as they are Great and Certain; and the Oppressed Part of Mankind have Cause to regard the Persons of those who Affirm and Maintain them, as the *Fathers* of the Liberties of Humane Nature, and the *Guardians* of the Peace and Felicity of the World.

But the particular Discourse of the Four, which I mean to consider, is that concerning the Divinity of our Saviour. Here the first thing to be noted, is: What Explanations of the *Trinity*, and the Divinity of our Saviour, his Lordship either expressly Rejects, or however intimates his Dislike of 'em, and meddles not with their Defence.

He

He owns, p. 102. that the *Three* are more than *three Names*, or *three outward Oeconomies*: i. e. He is not in the Error of Dr. Wallis, that the Trinity is only these three Respects or Relations of God towards his Creatures; that he is their *Creator*, *Redeemer*, and *Sanctifier*: for this is not a Trinity of Persons, but of *Names*, and outward *Oeconomies* or *Administrations*.

He confesses, p. 131. the *Three* are not three *Distinct Beings*, i. e. he dislikes the (too apparent) Tritheism of Dr. Sherlock, and Mr. H—w. He would neither confound the *Persons*, with Dr. Wallis; nor divide the *Nature*, or multiply the Deity, with Mr. H—w and Dr. Sherlock.

As to the *Ancients*, he intimates (at p. 98.) his Acknowledgment, that they represented the *Three*, as having the same Substance, or Essence, or Being, only in a general Sense; as all Humane Souls have the same Substance, that is, are the same *Order* or *Sort* of Beings: and that they intitled them to different Operations, not only in an Oeconomical Way; but so that one of the Divine Persons *did*, what the other *did not*. He says, this Explication is indeed very easily apprehended; but it seems directly to assert *Three Gods*, contrary to the most express Declarations of the Old and New Testaments.

This (this Tritheism of the *Ancients* or *Fathers*) he saith was the Reason, why others afterwards took another Way of explaining the Trinity. Those others were the School-men, or the *Divines of the Middle Ages*: who make it their Foundation, that the Deity is *one* (*Numerical*) Being. He observes, that the School-men considered, that the Soul of Man has *Intellection*, and *Love*, flowing from its Essence: so they conceived, that the primary Act of the Divine Essence was its *Intellection* or *Wisdom*, by which it saw all things, and in which as in an *Inward Word* it designed all things, and this they thought might be called the *Sum*, as being the Generation of the Eternal Mind; while from the Fountain-Principle together with

its *Inward Word*, there did arise a *Love* that was to issue from both, and was to be the Soul of the Creation, but more particularly to animate the Church. He saith hereupon, this grew to be the universally received Explication; but made not the Trinity to be better understood, or more firmly believed: and others hereupon took advantage, to represent these Subtilties, as *Dregs*, either of the *Doctrines* of the Valentinian Hereticks, or of Platonic Notions.

These are honest Concessions; and which others of the more Learned Trinitarians, have owned before his Lordship; but they give us occasion, to make this Reflection: That 'tis very unreasonable in the Trinitarians, to lay so great a Stress as they do, on the Doctrine of the Trinity; when the most Learned of their own Party are constrained to such Acknowledgments as these. That the Explication of this (pretended) Mystery by the *Fathers*, is a direct Tritheism, and contrary to the most express Declarations of the Old and New Testaments. That the Account given by the Schools, or Divines of the Middle Ages, is only a refining upon the *Dregs* of the Valentinian Hereticks, and of the Heathen Platonists. And for our present Writers on this Mystery, that neither their *Trinity* of *Names* and outward *Oeconomies*, or *Administrations*, nor that of *three distinct Beings*, are at all passable. What shall we do here, which Way shall we turn us; what shall we believe? If you say, believe the Trinity: as they cannot (you see) agree what is to be meant thereby; so to believe the word *Trinity*, without any determinate Notion to answer or explain it, is to believe Nothing at all.

But what says his Lordship himself? will he bring us, or help to bring us, out of these Mazes? Not in the least; he pretends not to tell us, what we ought to understand by the *Three*, as he speaks: he seems not unwilling to say, *Three Persons*; but to avoid the Dangers of so speaking, he is careful to tell us, p. 96. "By Person (here) is not meant, what we commonly understand by that word, a complete Intelligent Being, distinct  
" from

"from every other Being, but only that every one of the *Blessed Three* has a peculiar Distinction. In short; He adventures no further in this (dangerous) Mystery, than to call the Trinity, the *Blessed Three*; and this he repeats upon all Occasions. It is true, till we know what *Three* he means, we can neither oppose, nor receive his Doctrine: but in the mean time, we must tell him, that we approve not his *Way of Expressing himself*; 'tis Unscriptural, nay 'tis contrary to Scripture. The Scriptures often tell us, of the *Holy One*, and the *Blessed One*; never of the *Blessed Three*, or the *Holy Three*. But besides, he that tells us of the *Three*, and when he says most, the *Holy Three*; if this be all the Trinity he knows, or however dares speak of, I shall not be at all afraid to answer, 'tis a *Triunity of Ciphers*, and that *never so many Ciphers make nothing at all*: and 'tis a *Mystery* only in this respect, that *neither he nor we know what is meant*.

His Lordship spends some Pages in showing, that there really are some *Mysteries*, which we find our *stomachs constrained to believe*; though there lay against them such insuperable Difficulties, as amount to a *Demonstration* that they cannot be. His Instances, I grant, are more judicious and better chose in divers respects, (chiefly in this, that he has not sought for Mysteries that may destroy our Notions concerning God, and his Perfections) than the Instances of (pretended) Mystery, advanced by others. I am not at leisure; I confess, I wish I were; to discuss thoroughly the Pretences of our Opposers, concerning Mysteries: to these Instances therefore of his Lordship, I shall now only say, that I judge, one might choose such a side of the Questions or Difficulties he proposes, that there would not lay, as he affirms, such *Objections* as amount to a *Demonstration* against it, no nor such as should amount to a *Probability*. But now what if there were such Mysteries, as he contends for? Why, from thence he infers two things; of which I confess, if they could be truly inferred from the *Populatum*, they would do essential Service

to his present Cause. I will by and by consider these two Inferences; but at present, in answer to his Discourse about Mysteries in general, I will offer to his Lordship, the following Questions and Remarks.

1. Will his Lordship so far own, what he hath said about Mysteries, as to say also; that we are so made by God, that after all our Consideration and Industry, we cannot certainly distinguish between *Mystery* and *Nonsense*, or between *Mystery* and *Contradictions*? Undoubtedly, all Certainty, nay all Science or Knowledge is destroyed, if we are, so made by God; that *Contradictions* and *Nonsense* cannot by us be distinguished, from *Difficulties* and *Mysteries*. Why do we argue at all, on the one Side or on the other, if there is no knowing, when the Matter proposed to our Consideration is *impossible to be true*, and when 'tis only *difficult and mysterious*? May there not be such an *apparatus*, and *multiform Contradiction*, in some things proposed to us to be believed; that after all that his Lordship hath said, to prove there are *Mysteries*; those things may certainly appear to be not Mysteries; but *unquestionable Contradictions* and *Impossibilities*, or *pure Nonsense*? Will he say, we know nothing; we have no Certainty of Truth or Falshood, or of the Possibility and Impossibility of things? He must say so, if he affirms, we cannot know what is *Nonsense*; or cannot tell what is a *Contradiction* to itself.

They propound to us to believe, that there is an Almighty and All-knowing Father; that there is besides him, an Almighty All-knowing Son; and a Third (they dare not say what, but a Third) like to the two former, that is, as Almighty and All-knowing as they. We cry out hereupon, Away with your *Three Gods*; we have learned both from the Word of God, and from his Works, that there is but *one Almighty and All-knowing*; whom Men have agreed to denote, by this Name (or Word) *God*. They reply; that they believe *but one God*: but 'tis true also, though 'tis an incomprehensible



the *Mystery*, as well as many other great Truths are; that this one God is made up of these Three, an Almighty All-knowing Father, his Almighty All-knowing Son, and a Third who also is Almighty and All-knowing. Work and worke, say we; a Mystery do ye call this? Why, 'tis a glaring Contradiction, a palpable Inconsistency to it self, and therefore a flat Impossibility. Is it not a Contradiction, to tell us of one God, who is made up of Three Gods? Every one of these, because he is confessed to be Almighty and All-knowing, is a most confounding and perfect God; and is to confess to be, by your selves: therefore it must of necessity be a Contradiction to say, all Three are but One God. This Answer is so self-evident, that it divides our Opposers into a great many Parties; who are ashamed of, and disclaim one another, as Hereticks. Some of them; as his Lordship here, think is their best way to own, and even to commend for it: "there may be *Mysteries*, against which there lay such Difficulties, as seem to us to be *no less than Demonstrations* against those *Mysteries*; and yet those Difficulties (or *Demonstrations* against them) notwithstanding, they are great Truths. So his Lordship says expressly in p. 87, and 'tis what he aims to prove, by all the Instances he gives us of *Mysteries*. Every one sees, 'tis as much as to say, that Contradictions and Self-inconsistency are no cogent Argument, to prove a thing is not true: there may lay *Demonstrations* against a thing, and yet it may be true, he saith; and with him, a very great Party. But other Parties of 'em, are ashamed of this; they see 'tis an Answer, that destroys all Certainty and blows out all Knowledge at once: they think it therefore incumbent upon 'em, to evince that the Trinity implies no Contradiction, or what is the same, that there lays *no Demonstrations* against it: they acknowledge, that 'tis necessary to find such an Explanation of the Trinity, as will free it from all Contradiction, or *Demonstrations* to the contrary; which they ingeniously confess is as much as to

say, from being impossible. From hence have come so many (contrary) Explanations of the Trinity; Dr. *Sterck's*, Dr. *S—r's*, Mr. *Hosker's*, Mr. *H—w's*, Dr. *Cudworth's*, and many more. But those Trinitarians that are not for *Explanations*, but *Mysteries*, reject these Explanations; with as much Reason, and as much Scorn, as the Explicators reject such a *Mystical Trinity* as is inconsistent with it self, and against which (as his Lordship speaks) there lay such Difficulties as amount to a *Demonstration*. The Trinitarians that take the *Mystical* way, plainly see, and openly profess, that these Explanations either confound the *Possumus*, and so reduce all back to Sabellianism and Socinianism; as the Explanations of Dr. *Wallis*, Dr. *S—r's*, and Mr. *Hosker*; or they too openly imply Three Gods, as the Explanations of Dr. *Sterck*, Mr. *H—w*, Dr. *Cudworth*, and the Author of the *Propositions*. In short; I say, the Contradiction and Self-inconsistency that we find in their Doctrine of the Trinity, does fatally and unconscionably divide our Opposers. Those of 'em that are for such *Mysteries*, against which there lay *Demonstrations*, are condemned universally by all the other Parties; as destroying all Certainty, nay and all *Science*, and taking away the Distinction of *True* and *False*, of *Possible* and *Impossible*. The other Parties are accused by these, and also mutually accuse one another; either of the Heresy of Sabellianism, the same with that of Socinianism which they pretend to oppose: or of that direct Apostasy from Christianity, *Trithemism*, or Three Gods. His Lordship is embarked, with the first of these Parties: He is to answer, how we shall ever distinguish between Possible and Impossible, Mystery and Contradiction, Difficulties and flat Nonsense; if, as he says, and sees also, that he is forced (by the Nature of his Hypothesis) to say, that there may be *Mysteries* which are true, though there lay such Difficulties against them, that they amount to a *Demonstration* that they cannot be. This is what both he, and the Bishop of Worcester, pretend to prove, by

by the Instances which they give of *Insolubles*: they endeavour to show, that what Side soever you take of the Question proposed, you shall find your Way hedged up with (horrid) *Demonstrations to the contrary*.

2. His Lordship says, there are things which we must confess to be; and yet there lie such Difficulties, as amount to a Demonstration against them. For Instance; we doubt not, that Motion and Bodies are; yet their Nature is incumbered with *Insoluble Difficulties*: We cannot answer (he saith) the *Demonstrations and Objections* that lie against them. P. 87, 89.

I say now, suppose it were true, that *Insoluble Difficulties*, and *Unanswerable Objections and Demonstrations*, as he says, did lie against the Existence or Being of *Motion and Bodies*; yet how does this help the Doctrine of the Trinity? For if we believe that there are Bodies and *Motion*, 'tis because we have such *visible and sensible* Evidences, that they really are; that the Difficulties and Demonstrations (against them) which his Lordship calls *Insoluble and Unanswerable*, do not in the least move us or him. When we compare those (pretended) Demonstrations, with the manifold Evidence that all Men have by *Sense*, of the Existence of Motion and Bodies; we All as much believe them to be, as if there were no Objections at all against their Being, nor any Difficulties in their Natures. So also in all other *Miraculous and Unaccountable Things*; if Men believe them, 'tis always on some *Sensible* Evidence, or an Evidence *superior to that of Sense*, and most clearly superior to the Evidence against them. In short, no *Mysteries*, no *Unaccountable Things* are ever believed by Men; I mean, that *are not in Sense, or other Senses*; except only when they perceive, that the *Positive Evidence* for those Mysteries, is Uncontestable by a *Sober Man*.

But will his Lordship pretend, that he hath such an Evidence as this, for the *Divinity* (as he calls them) of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Satisfaction? hath he

for them any *sensible* Evidence, as there is for *Bodies and Motion*; or any Evidence *superior to that of Sense*; as there is for another of his Instances, a blind Man's believing Colours and Sight, on the unanimous Report of Others, tho' he himself can actually perceive no such thing? Or last of all, hath he such an Evidence, as is (on some Accounts or other) not Contestable, by sober, teachable, and judicious Persons; as there is for the Roundness of the Earth, and consequently for the *Antipodes*, who walk (with respect to Us, and our Hemisphere) with their Heads downwards? On the contrary, no Man knows better than his Lordship does, that there never was alledged for his Mysteries, any Evidence from *Sense*, or from *Reason*, but only from Authority; that is, some *dubious Text* of Holy Scripture; so doubtful, that he cannot instance in one of them, but what is rejected as Impertinent, by some or other of the Ablest Interpreters and Critics of his own Party. The Texts he has to alledge, he knows very well, are either of *ambiguous uncertain Meaning*, in the Original Hebrew and Greek, or of *supposed Authority*; that is to say, there is very great cause to think they have been Corrupted and Falsified, by the Fraud or Negligence of Publishers. Is it well done, to require the belief of Mysteries, against which there lie *Demonstrations and Insoluble Difficulties*, as he confesses, on such Evidences as these; Evidences that are given up, and even despised by divers of the most Learned (which in this Case is to say, the most qualified to judge) of his own Party? There are divers most Learned Men, that have written whole Volumes against the *Unaccountable*, who after all confess, we are clearly Superior at the two Weapons, of *Reason and Sense*. And that to Establish the Doctrines of the Trinity, and Incarnation, in any considering Man's belief, the Church's Authority and Pretensions to assign the true Interpretation of Ambiguous and Suspected Texts, must be admitted. Divers of 'em have published it, in those

very Writings which they directed against us; that were it not for the Authority of the Church, of which they cannot doubt, they would be Unitarians, or Nothing. He that has a mind to see a great Collection of Testimonies to this Purpose, from the most eminent Writers, may consult *Chr. Sandius, Hist. Eccl. L. 1. from P. 152, to the End of that First Book.*

I come now to the Inferences, that his Lordship makes, from what he had discoursed, and thinks he had proved, concerning Mysteries.

1. He saith, P. 90. "If the bare Difference of Age and Education, will make Thoughts that are Plain and Easy to *some*, seem Unconceivable to *others*; this ought, when applied to the Divine Essence, make us conclude, that there may be Mysteries beyond our Comprehensions, in that Being of Infinite Elevation above Us. And therefore, if God lets out *any Hints* of any such Mysteries to us, we ought to receive them in a plain Sense, as the words naturally bear: And if this [Sense] should happen to import that which does not agree with our Conceptions of other things, we ought not to wrest it to *some other Sense that may seem safer to us.* Ay verily, this would do the Business indeed, for the Trinity, and all other Absurd and Impossible Doctrines; for the Transubstantiation more than any other, because the *Hints* (as his Lordship speaks) are so broad for it.

He saith in effect, that because we may grow wiser and more discerning by Age and Instruction, so as to understand Things, which we did not before comprehend; and because God is a Being of Infinite Elevation above us: Therefore if we meet in Holy Scripture a *Hint*, (as suppose a Metaphor, a Metonymy, an Allegory, or an equivocal ambiguous Word or Expression) we are not to interpret such *Hint*, by our Conception and Knowledge of Things, or in a Sense that appears Easy and Rational to us; but according to the naked Words, the meer

Clink and Sound of the Words. But what wild work would this way of Interpreting make, or rather has it made already, in Religion? *This is my Body*, says our Saviour concerning the Sacrament; the Papists go away presently with this *Hint*, which according to the meer sound of the Words may import, that the Bread of the Sacrament is really and verily made to be the Substance of Christ's Body, in which he was Crucified. And from hence they raise the *Mystery of Transubstantiation*, as the Lutherans raise the *Mystery of Consubstantiation*: And Others raise a greater *Mystery* than both these, even the *Mystery of a Real Presence of Christ's Body* in the Sacrament, tho' (by their own Confession) neither the *Substance* nor *Accidents* of his Body are there, but in Heaven: But some think, they ought not to have called themselves the *Reformed*; as least it appears not, that they are reformed from worse Errors than those of *Rome*, if worse could be.

When ye Pray, ye shall say, *Our Father which art in Heaven*, saith our Saviour; and other Texts tell us of the Eyes, Hand, Arm, Bowels, Back-pains, the Anger, Love, Fear, of God: From these *Hints*, much broader than any his Lordship can alledge for the Trinity; some of the *Fathers*, and divers *Moderns* infer, that God is not Essentially or Personally *Omnipresent*; and that he is made up of such *Parts* and *Passions* as a Man has, and dwells in Heaven, governing the World by his *Ministring Spirits*, the Angels. These *Hints*, and abundance more that might be named, plainly (I think) show, that we must not fall to coining of *Mysteries*, against which there lie Demonstrations, on occasions of *Hints*, which may be interpreted to a Possible and Rational Sense. I am so little of his Lordship's Judgment, concerning the wonderful Authority of *Hints*, that I am of Opinion, that the most Direct and Ample Expressions, that imply (if taken in their more usual Signification) an impossible Sense or Doctrine, or an Absurd and Contradictory, must be understood as spoken.

spoken and intended *Figuratively*; and this not only in Scripture, but in all other Writings and Writers. The Reason is, when any Matter is very clear and certain, as all grant the Unity of God is, both in Reason and in Scripture, Writers speak negligently and securely. They use Equivocal or *Ambiguous Words*, and Metaphorical or *Figurative Expressions*, because they do not so much suspect the Understanding and good Sense of their Readers, as once to think, that they can take these Expressions, in a Sense that is contrary to known and agreed Truths. But I shall say more of this; and clear it further, in the Remarks I intend to make, on the Sermons of his Grace the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury; who insists very much on the Clearness of some *Hints*, in favour of the Trinity, and the Divinity of our Saviour.

3. He saith, P. 94. "No Part of the "Pled for Mysteries, belongs to the *Trans-  
substantiation*. No? What has this good, old, staunch *Mystery* done, that it must be now kick'd out of the number of Mysteries, among which it has held a very honourable Rank this many Ages? Certainly, it has all the possible Characters, and Marks of *Mystery*, that any the most *Orthodox Mystery* of 'emall has, or can have. It is a *Mystery*, (like all his Lordship's other Mysteries) *against which there lay such Difficulties, as amount to a Demonstration, that it cannot possibly be.* And then for *Hints*, his Lordship's other Mark of *Mystery*; It excels, in them. For no one can deny, that *this is my Body*; and again, *who so eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, hath Eternal Life*: And again, the Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the *Communion of the Blood of Christ*; and the Bread which we break, is it not the *Communion of the Body of Christ*? I say, who can deny that these (and divers more the like) are *Hints*; which (if taken as his Lordship directs) in their plain Sense; and as the Words naturally bear, do very much favour the Presence of Transubstantiation, and of that other (greater) *Mystery, Real Presence*?

But he saith, *Ibid.* "Transubstantiation must not be a *Mystery*, because there is "against it, the Evidence of *Sense*, in an "Object of *Sense*: for *Sense* plainly represents to us the *Bread and Wine* to be still the same, that they were before the Consecration.

This is Faulty every way. For, 1. It is not pretended by the Papists, that the Bread and Wine have received any the least Change, in what is an Object of *Sense*. The Papists, following the Philosophy of *Aristotle*, distinguish in Bodies these two things; the *Accidents* (such as the Quantity, Figure, Colour, Smell, Taste, and such-like) which are Objects of our Senses: and the *Substance*, which bears, and is clothed (as it were) with these *Visible and Sensible Accidents*; but is it self Invisible, and the Object of our Understandings, not of our Senses. They say hereupon, our Saviour having called the Sacrament, his *Body and Blood*, because our Senses assure us, there is no change of the (sensible) *Accidents*; therefore the Change that is made must be in the (Invisible) *Substance*: Which Change they therefore call *Transubstantiation*. Nor do they say, that Christ is Corporally (or Bodily) present in the Sacrament, but that his Body is present in a *Spiritual manner*: As Cardinal Bellarmine largely Discourses, *De Euchar.* L. 1. c. 2. It may not be amiss to subjoin his very words. *Itaq; dicimus, Christum esse in Eucharistia, Vere Realiter Substantialiter, sed non Corporaliter (id est, eo modo quo suspente Natura existunt Corpora) nec Sensibiliter nec Mobiliter: Imò contrà dici potest, esse Spiritualiter, ut S. Bernardus loquitur; qui affirmat, in Sacramento exhiberi nobis veram Carnis substantiam, sed Spiritualiter, non Carnaliter.*

His Lordship therefore is greatly out, in pretending that the Transubstantiation, as held by the Papists, is contradicted by *Sense*, in an Object of *Sense*. And if we will speak the Truth about the Transubstantiation, 'tis not an Impiety, but only a Philosophical Error, or Folly. The Impiety consists not in the mere Doctrine of Transubstantiation, but

but. In the Additions made to it. As, *That the Substance of Bread being thus turned into the Substance of Christ's Body, is therefore, and thereby a Propitiatory Sacrifice; offer'd to God by the Priest, in full Satisfaction for the Sins of the Dead and Living: Again, That the Substance of Bread being thus turned into the Substance of the Lord's Body, which Body is (personally) united to God the Son; therefore the Sacrament is God and Man, and must be worshipped as such: And lastly, That it being the Priest that makes this miraculous Change in the Substance of the Bread, turning it into the Substance of Christ God-Man; the Priest may be thereupon called, the Maker of God, as God is the Maker of all other things.* These are the Impieties, that ought to be objected to the Popish Writers; not the simple Error about the Change of the Substance, which is merely a Folly, and nothing more: 'tis a Mistake into which they have been cozen'd, by the Philosophy of *Aristotle*.

But, 2. Whereas his Lordship says, Transubstantiation is no Mystery, *because 'tis contradicted by Sense, in an Object of Sense*; this Answer supposes, that *Sense* is an *Infallible Evidence*, in an Object of *Sense*: but this, I utterly deny. For the Sense of *Sight*, for instance, represents the *Our* in the Water to be crooked; though 'tis certain that the *Our* is straight: It falsely reports the *Figures* and *Colours* of Bodies, if such Bodies are at some distance from us; for it represents all Colours, at a distance, as *dark*, and *Sceptles* and other *Square* Bodies as *Round*: and so add no more, *Sense* makes abundance of False and Chimerical Scenes in our sleep; for it pretends to exhibit to us Persons and Things that are not, nor ever were or can be.

3. Transubstantiation is contradicted by *Sense*, saith his Lordship, in an Object of *Sense*; therefore 'tis a false Mystery. This is as much as to say, that a *Faculty* or *Power* judging of its proper Object, always judges truly, and must determine our Belief. He don't say so, or his Reasoning is nothing. I ask now, of what *Faculty* or *Power* is Al-

mighty God the Object? We will answer, God is the Object not of *Sense*, which discerns him not; but of *Reason*, which discovers, and sees this most Glorious Being. Therefore *Reason*, by his Lordship's own Argument, judges infallibly concerning God, and must determine our Belief about him; we must hearken to Reason, when it finds Contradictions, in what Men affirm concerning God. God being the Object of Reason, and every Faculty judging truly of its proper Object, as his Lordship contends; that cannot be true of God, which Reason disclaims as a Contradiction; as the Notion of a Trinity of Persons, *every one of which is a Perfect God, and yet all of them but One God*. In a word; If his Lordship had studied for it all his Life-time, he could never have given to the Socinians a greater Advantage, than is implied in this Answer of his: if his Answer is true, we are sure the *Trinity* is a False Mystery, as False as he can pretend the Transubstantiation is; for 'tis contradicted by *Reason*, in an Object of *Reason*.

When his Lordship pleases, he may try his Dexterity upon these Replies to his Defence of Mysteries; but I do not think he will get more Credit and Honour in opposing the Unity of God, than others have done before him: 'tis a Truth so Great, so Illustrious, and so Necessary, that no Man ever attacked it, without losing a great part of his Stock of Reputation.

But I come to the Arguments, used by his Lordship to prove, That our Lord Jesus Christ is the most High God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth. They are such, as his Cause affords; 'tis not his fault, if they are no better.

1. He saith, p. 110. Almighty God gave to himself a peculiar Name, the name *Yhovah*; which Name is by the *Jews* always translated by *יהוה*, which we render by *Lord*: therefore the Writers of the New Testament, being *Jews* by Birth and Education, always calling our Blessed Saviour by the name *יהוה* or *Lord*; it is impossible to imagine, but



but that they intended thereby, that he is true *Jehovah*. As an Appendix to this *Mighty* Argument, he adds at p. 113. that it was promised to the Jews, by the Prophets in the Name of God, that the Glory of their *Second House* (or Temple) should be greater than the Glory of the *First House*; and in the *Times* of this *Second House*, I will give Peace, saith the Lord; *Haggai* 2. 6, 7, 8, 9. He saith hereupon, that *Jehovah* dwelt in the former House, in a Cloud of Glory: therefore if *Jehovah* did not so dwell in the Person of our Saviour, that he became thereby true God, 'tis impossible to make it appear, that the Glory of the second Temple was equal to the Glory of the first: This Arguing he calleth, *Building upon sure Ground*. He adds, p. 117, 118. These Expressions of the Apostles and Prophets are a most Gross Abuse, put on the World, if the *Messias* (or Christ) be not true *Jehovah*; and the Apostles have incurred the Wo denounced by our Saviour, *to those Persons, by whom Scandalis came*. This, I think, might well have been spared: and it serves only to show, that early and interested Prepossession, or Prejudice, is a Magnifying-glass, that makes Mountains of Mole-hills; or the greatest Matters of meer Nothings. It was not by such Trivial Reasonings as these, that his Lordship acquired that Reputation, that he has gained in the World.

(1.) Whereas 'tis the *Foundation*, on which this Argument stands; that *Jehovah* is a Name which God hath chosen to be peculiar to himself: his Lordship ought, well to have proved this *Postulatum*. For he knows, that the Socinians deny it, and pretend to prove by divers Instances and Examples from Scripture, that the name *Jehovah* is given to divers Persons besides Almighty God; to particular Persons, and to Communities, nay and to such Places as God has honoured with his Presence, or with the Presence of Angels who represented his Person: He knows too, without doubt, that divers of the most Learned Interpreters and Critics of his own Party, have owned on several Parts of the

Old Testament; that the Name *Jehovah* is given in Scripture, to many more besides Almighty God, both Angels and Places, and Communities of Men. The Angel that appeared to *Mosis* in the Burning Bush, is called *Jehovah*, *Exod.* 3. 2, 3, 4. The City of *Jerusalem* is called *Jehovah Tsion*, *Jer.* 33. 15. He ought therefore, to have well proved this Ground of his whole Reasoning; that *Jehovah* is a Name peculiar to God: and because he hath not in the least offer'd at that, but has taken for granted what he knows we deny; I wonder he should call his Argument, *Building upon sure Ground*. I acknowledge, that the Translators of our English Bible, that were employed by King James, have thus rendered *Psi.* 83. 18. *Thou whose Name alone is Jehovah, art the most High over all the Earth*. But seeing these Translators scarce made any Alteration in the former Bible, but what they took from *X. Pagnin*, 'tis much (and without all Reason) that upon this Text they deserted their Master. *Pagnin*, and after him the English Geneva Translation, read that Text after this manner: *Thou who art Named Jehovah, art Alone; and the most High over all the Earth*. They mean, *Jehovah* is a Being by himself; without Companions, Like, or Equal: and 'tis he that is the most High over all the Earth; that is, 'tis he that *ruleth* over all the Earth. This is an excellent Sense; and wholly destroys the Notion of a Trinity of Divine Persons, equal in Power and Excellence. And yet to deal ingenuously, considering the Syntax and Structure of the Hebrew words, I do not think either of these Translations is very dextrous: that of *Pagnin* and the Geneva Bible, is somewhat Affected; the English of our Common Bible, was designed on purpose, the Translators carried an Eye upon these Questions, that we are now considering. The true Translation of the Text, favours neither one Side nor the other; it is certainly this: *Thou whose Name is Jehovah, art Alone the most High, over all the Earth*: i. e. *Thou alone art he, or thou only art he, who is the sovereign and unaccountable Disposer*

posers of all the Kingdoms and Transactions of the World.

(2.) He saith; *Jehovah* is the peculiar Name of God: and this Hebrew Name being always by the Jews translated by *xwē*, or *Lord*; the Writers of the New Testament, who were Jews by Birth and Education, in calling Jesus Christ *xwē*, do intimate most certainly to us, that he is the true *Jehovah*. I find, we are like to have a great many *Jehovahs*, more than his Lordship himself will approve of: for if this be a good Reason, he can never hinder *Pontius Pilate* also, from being *Jehovah*; for the High-Priests, and the Pharisees, whom his Lordship will not deny to be Jews, and that both by Birth and Education, call *Pilate* by the Name *xwē*, Mat. 27. 63. Sir, (in the Greek *is xwē*) we remember that *Discours* said, while he was yet alive, After three Days I will rise again. Command therefore that the Sepulchre be made sure, until the third Day. The very Truth is, the word *xwē*, which his Lordship says was by the Jews appropriated to God, as the most proper Word to answer the Name *Jehovah*; I say that Word was used by the Jews, both in Speaking and Writing, to answer to the English words *Master* and *Sir*: And they did not only, not appropriate it, to God, but used it to Persons of a very low Quality. Thus, we find one of the Disciples accounting no higher Person than a Gardiner, with the Title *xwē*, John 20. 15. Sir, (in the Greek *xwē*) if thou hast removed him from hence, tell me where thou hast laid him.

(3.) He saith, 'tis impossible to imagine, that the Glory of the Second Temple, should be greater than the Glory of the First Temple; if *Jehovah* did not so dwell in Jesus Christ, that he became thereby truly *Jehovah*: For 'tis certain, God honoured the First Temple with a *Cloud of Glory*, in which was the Majesty of God. He quotes *Haggai* 2. 6, 7, 8, 9. where that Prophet foretels, as his Lordship saith, that God would fill the Second House (or Temple) with his *Glory*: And that this *Glory* should be greater,

than the *Glory* in the Former House. He saith further, God made the *Glory* which inhabited the Second House, to be greater than the *Glory* in the First House; because in the First House, God appeared to them only in a *Cloud of Glory*; which *Cloud* was nothing but a Mass of meer Matter; but in the Second Temple he came to them in the Body and Soul of Jesus Christ, and a Soul is a perfecter sort of Being, than meer Matter: so that thus it was truly fulfilled what the Prophet had said, that God would so fill the Second House with his *Glory*, that the *Glory* should be greater than the *Glory* in the First House. I hope, his Lordship did not designedly, but he has added the word *his* to the Text of the Prophet; which word, if taken away, this whole (Chimerical) Comment falls to the Ground. He represents the Prophet as saying, that God would fill the Second Temple with his *Glory*; as if the Prophet intended to allude to the *Cloud of Glory* which sometimes appeared in the First Temple, and in which (Cloud) the Majesty of God was supposed to be: But the Prophet says no such thing; and it appears, with Certainty, that it was not in his Thoughts. The Prophet saith only, the Lord will fill this House with *Glory*, and the *Glory* of this latter House shall be greater than the *Glory* of the former House. Of which words, the obvious and certain Meaning is this; whereas we have built such a House to God, as our present Straits and Poverty will allow: All Gold and Silver are the Lord's, and he will in due time cause this House to be more Glorious and Magnificent, than the first House (built by *Solomon*) was. The Question now is; How, and when this Prophecy was fulfilled? His Lordship answers, 'tis impossible to imagine, how it should be fulfilled, but only in the Person of our Saviour; in whom the Glorious Majesty of God dwelt Bodily, or so as to be one Person with him. We, on the contrary, cannot imagine how this (supposing it to be Possible, and True) should make the Second Temple a whit more Glorious,

rious, than of it self it was: the Temple had no more Glory, by the Glory of our Saviour, than any other Houfe or Place, to which he reforted. Besides which, his Lordship knows well, that *our Saviour never entered into that Temple*, none but the Priests could enter into the Temple. When our Saviour, or other Lay Persons, are said to enter into the Temple; His Lordship knows very well, that the meaning is, into one of the *Courts* or *Yards* of the Temple, where the People prayed, and where Sacrifices were sold and offered. The Kings themselves never entered into the Temple; none but the Priests entered there, to light the Candles, set the Shew-bread, burn the Incense, sprinkle some Drops of the Blood of their Sacrifices. Therefore concerning that Prophecy, that the Glory of the Second House, should be greater than the Magnificence or Glory of the First: *We Answer*, with all the Historians of the Jewish Nation, that it was fulfilled, by King *Herod*, surnamed *the Great*. This Prince rebuilt the Second Temple, with such ample Spaces, and such admirable Architecture, that it was confes'd by All, far to excel the Temple built by *Solomon*, here called *the First House*, or Temple.

2. But he insists with yet more Earnestness, as (were the thing True) well he may, on another Consideration; even *the Divine Worship* payed, or commanded to be paid, to our Saviour, in the Books of the New Testament. He saith, 'Tis a Charge often renewed to us in the New Testament, to worship God only; yet at the same time we find, that *All the Acts of Adoration* by which we worship God, are also performed to Christ; from whence it will follow, that either he is *true God*, or the Christian Religion sets up *Idolatry*; to destroy which, was (confessedly) its chief Design. The Acts of Worship, which he finds performed to the Lord Christ, are these. That Grace, and Mercy, and Peace, are prayed for from him, to all the Churches. That this Phrase

is used concerning him, *Glory be to him for ever and ever*. That all in Heaven and Earth must Confess him, and Bow before him; the very Angels are commanded to worship him. He saith, these things cannot be excused, by pretending, that Christ being God's Ambassador, therefore such great Respects are performed to him; for the Angels have often been sent on Divine Delegations, and yet *never* were worshipped, but refused to be worshipped. Furthermore, if as the Socinians pretend, the Apostles had worshipped a *Disfined Man*, or a Man that was made a God, the Jews would most certainly have accused them of *Idolatry*; and this would have been the main Plea they would have used against Christianity: But we see, by the Scripture-History, the Jews never objected Idolatry to the Apostles, or to other Christians. The Reason therefore, why the Jews did not accuse the Apostles of Idolatry, was, because they knew very well, that they worshipped Christ on the Account of the Indwelling of the *Eternal WORD* in him; and they knew, that their Fathers had worshipped *the Cloud of Glory*, because of God's resting upon it. He concludes, that upon these Reasons, we may *well* and *safely* determine, that Christ was truly both God and Man. And he saith, that he cannot tell what to think of those Understandings, which, on the one side, cannot believe any thing concerning the Divine Nature, if it agrees not with their own Notions: And yet, on the other side, can swallow down *so vast an Absurdity* as this; that *the same Acts* in which we adore God, shall be at the *same time* offered to a Creature.

Let us begin at the Foot of this long Account.

(1.) He saith, that the same Acts in which we Adore God, should at the same time be Offer'd to a Creature, is a *vast Absurdity*. But his Lordship is guilty of a much *waster Inadvertence*; as he himself will be obliged to confess, so soon as ever he casts his Eyes on the following Texts: 1 *Chron.*

29. 20. *All the Congregation Blessed the Lord God of their Fathers; and Bowing their Heads, Worshipped the Lord and the King.* He will not be able to deny, that at the *same Time*, and in the *same Act*, namely by Incurvation, or *Bowing the Body and Head*, they worshipped God and the King. Neither was this *Worshipping* the Lord and the King together, and in the *same Act*, *Idolatry*: because it is not the *External Act*, which makes the *Idolatry*; but the *Mind* or *Intention* with which it is done. The People *Worshipped* (or *Bowed to*) God, as God; and to their King, not as God, but only as their King. What *Act* of Religious *Worship* can be higher than, or so much as equal to, an *Adjuration*? yet we shall find no less Person than an Apostle, joining Creatures with God, in this *Act*: 1 Tim. 2. 21. *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels.* Verba sunt Adjurantis & Obtestantis, they are Words of *Adjuration*, saith *Estius* in l. Nor is it questioned by any Interpreter, that I know of. To *Believe* in God, and to *Fear* him, are Acts of Adoration acknowledged by his Lordship himself; yet we find these Acts performed, jointly to God and his Prophets: 3 Sam. 12. 18. *The People greatly Feared the Lord, and Samuel.* Exod. 14. 31. *The People Believed in the Lord, and in his Servant Moses.* Indeed in this last Text, the English Translators have suppressed the small Particle in; for what Cause, every Body sees: but his Lordship knows, 'tis expressed in the original Hebrew; and by the *Interlinear*, which strictly follows the Hebrew Text.

In short; We say, the same outward Acts of *Worship* are given, at the *same Time*, to God and those who represent him, either as Prophets or Kings; without any *Idolatry*: because though the Acts are designed to Both, at the same time; yet with a different Intention. They are performed to God, as God; which is to say; as the Author of our Beings and Comforts, and as supream over All: but to Kings and Prophets, only as Persons whom God has appointed, either to exercise his Authority, or

to declare his Laws and Will; during his Pleasure.

(2.) Whereas he has a Large Discourse, to this effect; that the Jews would (very plausibly) have accused the Apostles, and first Christians, of *Idolatry*; if, as the Socinians pretend, they had worshipped a *Deified Man*, or a *Man made God*: there are abundance of exceptionable Things in that Discourse of his Lordship, to which I have neither Leisure, nor Inclination to reply, as some other (perhaps) would; I shall therefore answer, in short, only what is the Truth of the Case. The Socinians do not pretend, as is so often charged on them, that the Lord Christ is a *Deified Man*, or a *Man made God*: they believe him to be still a very Man, as he was upon Earth. They ascribe to him, none of the Properties or Attributes of the Divine Nature; Omnipresence, Omniscience, Omnipotence: they only say these Two things, which the Scriptures also (expressly) say. 1. That he is the Intercessor between God and Men. *His ever liveth*, saith the Apostle, *to make Intercession for us*, Heb. 7. 25. And 'tis very doubtful with us, whether this Intercession be Particular, that is for Particular Men, and their Particular Occasions; or only a General Mediation for All, by the Merit of his Strictures and Sufferings. But if his Intercession is for Particular Men, and their Particular Wants: yet neither We, nor our Distresses or Prayers, can be known to a Man in Heaven, but only by the Revelation of God to him; as by the same Revelation he may also know things to come, as the Prophets did: Rev. 1. 1. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him.* 2. He is also, as the Apostle speaks, *made Head over all things, to the Church*, Ephes. 1. 22. Which we understand thus; that he is the Church's Teacher, and Law-giver; and that he Protects, and also Directs the Church, as it pleases God to order from time to time; by the Ministry and Intervention of the Holy Angels, who are Ministering Spirits sent forth, to minister to those, who are Heirs of Salvation, Heb. 1. 14.

His

His Lordship will never be able to show, that this Doctrine makes a Man to be God, or (as he speaks) *Deifies a Man*: it makes him only the Minister of God; and that also, in no greater or higher Degree or Sphere, than a Humane Nature is capable of. But I very justly and truly retort this Charge of his Lordship against the Socinians, that they set up a *Deified Man*; against the far greater number of the Trinitarians: for they ascribe to the Humane Nature of Christ, or to Christ as Man, the Attributes and Properties of the Divine Nature. He knows, without doubt, that all the *Roman Catholics* affirm, that the Humane Nature of Christ (and not only the Person of the Son in that Nature) is *Omniscient*; and all the *Lutherans* contend, that his Humanity is *Omnipresent*: which in very deed, is to make a Man to be God, or a *Deified Man*.

(3.) He urges us with it, that this Phrase is used concerning our Saviour; *Glory be to him, for ever and ever*: and that All in Heaven and Earth, must *Bow* to him; the very Angels must *Worship* him.

He saith, *Glory* is wished to our Saviour, *for ever and ever*. But he will not deny, that *Glory*, and *Honour*, are Equivalent Terms; one signifies as much as the other, and the original Greek Word might have been rendered by either of them Indifferently: nor will he pretend, that *for ever and ever* implies more, than a single *for-ever*. Therefore, whereas he thinks it so great a matter, that *Honour* is wished to our Saviour *for ever*: I see not, what Hurt there were in it, if I wished as much to his Lordship. I shall not fear to be reckoned an *Idolater*, for wishing to his Lordship *perpetual Honour*, or Honour for ever. The Prophet *Daniel* complements a Heathen Prince, with an *O King live for ever*, Dan. 6. 21. I do not think, he would have scrupled to say, *O King, I wish thee Glory for ever*. In very deed, his Lordship is the First that ever pretended, to squeeze Divinity from a (meer, and ordinary) Eulogy.

But all must *Bow* to our Saviour; the very

Angels must *Worship* him. But will his Lordship prove to me, that they *Bow* to him, or *Worship* him, as God; or as owning him to be God. For we have seen but just now, that all the Congregation of *Israel* worshipped their King. Not only so, but Superiours in some Cases, worship their Inferiours; as the Husband his Wife, when he espouses her; and Kings salute their Subjects. To worship another, often signifies no more, than to salute them, by Bowing, or such like; which Superiours do to Inferiours. 'Tis therefore so far from being an Argument, that our Saviour is God, because (some sort of) *Worship* is paid to him; that if he has nothing else for it, it will not prove, that our Saviour is any way *Superiour* to them. But I have said so much of this, at Page 49 and 50, of the Answer to Mr. Milbourn; that till I see it satisfied, I need to add no more.

(4.) The last thing, in this 2d Objection of his Lordship, is; That *Grace*, *Mercy*, and *Peace* are prayed for, from the Lord Christ. We confess it; but let him also confess, that they are also prayed for from other Creatures, from the Angels of the Presence, as Divines have called them. Rev. 1. 4. *Grace be unto you, and Peace; from him which Is, and which Was, and is to Come: and from the seven Spirits that are before his Throne; and from Jesus Christ.*

These Blessings, *Grace* and *Peace* to the Churches, are prayed for; from God, as the original Fountain, and Giver, of every good and perfect Gift: from the seven Spirits of the Presence, and from the Lord Christ, as Intercessors with God for these his Mercies, for the Churches. But this Intercession is only in general, for all the Churches, and for all Mankind: not for particular Persons, from a particular Knowledge of their Wants, Desires, or Prayers. Which are known to God only; not to Others: or if to others, only by God's Revelation to them. And for this Reason; though they are Intercessors with God for us, yet we cannot pray to them: we can pray only to God, he only being



being All-knowing; because he only is Omnipresent. We may wish to one another Grace and Peace from God, and from our Intercessors with him; but we can pray but only to God: because he only perfectly knows what our State, Condition, or Deserts are, or when it is that we pray to him; they intercede but in general, as we our selves do for all the Faithful, though unknown to us.

It will be said here; but this Account supposes, that there are more Mediators with God, besides the Lord Christ: which is contrary to St. Paul, who saith expressly, *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jesus Christ, who gave himself a Ransom for All*, 1 Tim. 2. 3, 6. I answer; By a Mediator in that Text, is not meant an Intercessor; as if there were but one Intercessor either in Heaven or Earth, or but one who Prays or Intercedes for Grace and Mercy for the Church on Earth. For 'tis certain, that in the Sense of Intercession, the whole Church Triumphant is a Mediatrix (or Mediates) for the Church Militant upon Earth. The Blessed Angels, and the Souls of Just Men made Perfect, intercede for us; who are still labouring under Griefs and Temptations: nor is there any Learned Man, of whatever Sect or Perswasion, I know of, that doubts of it. But by a Mediator in that Text, is meant such a Mediator as the Apostle elsewhere speaks of, when he saith concerning the Law; *It was given by Angels, in the Hand of a Mediator*, Gal. 3. 19. that is, Angels delivered the Law immediately from God, but yet they spoke but a very little part of it to the People of Israel; they delivered the Law to that People by the Mediation, that is, by the Intervention of Moses: they delivered it to Moses, and he to Israel. In this very Sense and Respect, the Lord Christ is expressly called (by the Author to the Hebrews) *the Mediator of the New Covenant*, Heb. 12. 24. and *the Mediator of the Better Covenant*, or Testament, Heb. 8. 6. For the undoubted Meaning of those Texts, is; Jesus Christ is the Bringer or Messenger of

the New Covenant, from God to Men; God giveth us the New Covenant or Testament, by the Intervention, Mediation, or Hand of Jesus Christ. The Sense therefore of the Objected Text, is this; "Let Prayers and Supplications be made for all Men; for as there is one God who willeth the Salvation of All, because he is equally the Father of All: so there is one Intervening Person, the Mediator or Bringer of the Gospel; Jesus Christ who offer'd himself a Ransom for All.

Interpreters might easily have seen, that this was the Meaning of that Text; because it is a very valid Reason, why Prayer should be made for All, which is the thing the Apostle is there arguing for: and because the word *mediator*, properly signifies one by whose Intervention, a Message or other Dispatch is delivered; and accordingly, in the Lexicons it is rendred by the Latin word *Intermediarius*, a Messenger. In a word, I say; we have many Mediators with God, in the Sense of Intercession or Praying for us; namely, first all the Faithful on Earth, then all the Blessed in Heaven, whether Saints or Angels: but there is but one, even the Lord Christ, who is the Mediator of the New Covenant; that is, by whose Intervention, Mediation, or Hand, Mankind hath received the Gospel, from God the Author of it.

3. In the next place, his Lordship would establish the Divinity of Christ, by some Texts of Holy Scripture. He hath only cited them, without enlarging or criticising upon them: therefore for Answer, I refer my self to the *Brief History of the Unitarians*, and to the more full Account of them, in my Answer to Mr. Milbourn.

But whereas he says, they are so clear for his Purpose, and so many, that he that reads them, and yet will not acknowledg the Divinity of our Saviour, cannot but feel, that he is wrestling against the whole Current of the New Testament: I will intreat him to do but this one (fair) thing, in the next Edition of his Book; and I will thereupon engage, that

that the Socinians shall never more reply to him. Let him insert again these Texts into his Book, and with them the *Translations*, and *Interpretations* of them, by the Ablest Critics of his own Party: and after that, let me hear him tell his Reader, that to deny the Divinity of Christ, is to *wrestle against the whole Current of Scripture*. He will (assuredly) be ashamed of such *Rhetoricians*; he will have more Reverence, for the Censure that every Reader would pass on his Confidence.

Let him but say, for Instance, on the first Text (*Col. 1. 16.*) by him quoted, by Christ *were all things Created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth*: Let him say, how many Interpreters and Critics of his own Party render that Text, by Christ *were all things* (not Created, but) *Modelled*. Let him tell the Reader, how many *Fathers*, and among them *Athanasius*, and how many *Moderns*, understand that Text; as speaking not of the *Old Creation*, or the Creation of Heaven and Earth; but of the *New Creation*, or the Modelling of Things; that is, the Change that has been made in the World by the Lord Christ, Paganism and Idolatry being abolish'd upon Earth, and in Heaven the Angels themselves put under a new Chief or Head.

We are often told by our Opposers, that the Scriptures are *Clear* on their Side; and that the very *Current* of the Bible is for 'em. But the meaning of *this*, is only thus much; that they have been able to contrive a *Translation*, from very *Corrupt Copies* of the Greek, that in *some measure* may seem to *some*, to favour their Pretences. Why do they not acquaint the Reader, if they meant sincerely, that most of the Texts by them alledged, were wanting in the Copies of the Bible used by the *Fathers*; and in the most Ancient Copies yet remaining; and that for the rest, they have so Translated 'em in the Bibles that are given out to the People, that their own Critics give Uncontestable Reasons against those Translations. Let us take an Instance of both kinds. We are

told by the Party that calls it self the *Catholic Church*, that these here following, are words of St. John in his General Epistle. *There are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One*, 1 John 5. 7. His Lordship would have done a Generous Thing, if he had vouchsafed to inform the (poor gull'd) English Reader, that in very deed, this Text was Unknown to the *Fathers*, who treated of these Questions against the *Ancient Unitarians*. And that as late as *Erasmus*, there was but one Greek Copy to be found in all England, that had in it this Verse. And finally, after all, supposing it were a Genuine Part of Holy Scripture, yet the English *Geneva Bible* owns; that the meaning is not, these Three are *One God*, but these Three are *One in their Testimony*; because they are here considered as *Witnesses*, or as *bearing Record*. Let another Instance of the Fair Dealing of our Opposers in these Questions, be in *Rom. 9. 5.* *Of whom, as concerning the Flesh, Christ came; who is over all, God blessed for ever*. Is it certain, or but probable among their own Critics, that 'twas the Apostle's Intention, to say here, that the Lord Christ is God *over all, blessed for ever*? Let us but see what *H. Grotius* has noted on this Text. He observes, that the Greek Copies used by the Author of the Syriac, which is the most Ancient of the Oriental Translations, had not the word God; they only say of our Saviour here, *the blessed over All*. The same Illustrious Interpreter observes further, that *Erasmus* has noted, that the Copies of St. Cyprian, St. Hilary, and St. Chrysostom, had only *the Blessed over All*, above All, without the word God. But now allowing, that the word God were rightly read in this Text, yet two the most Eminent Critics, and Principal Masters of the Greek Tongue, have noted that St. Paul's words should have been *pointed*, and read, after this manner: *Of whom, as concerning the Flesh, Christ is come; the God over all be Blessed for ever, Amen*. So *Erasmus* and *Carcellanus* Translate here. According to this rendering,

rendering, our Saviour is not here called *God over All*: but the Apostle gives thanks to God over All, for his Unfpeakable Gift, our Lord Christ.

His Lordship is not ignorant, that as Much may be said, on all the Texts by him cited, for the Divinity of our Saviour. Therefore, I say, in his next Edition; when he cites his Texts *by whole-sale*, and objects to us *the Current of Scripture*: let him but give his Reader *the History, of those Texts*; how they are *read*, and how they have been *Translated*, by the most Eminent Interpreters of his own Party; and we promise him to be Silent. There will be no need of *our* Answers, or Defences; if there were but an Honest Edition of the Bible: that is to say, an Edition that should favour neither Party; but only should have in the Margin, *the Readings of Antient Copies* of the Hebrew and Greek, and *the Translations by Famous Critics and Interpreters*, not of ours, but of the Trinitarian Party. But this would raze the very Foundations of *Babylon*; it would make Divines, of our very Common People: And some are afraid, that after such a Service, there would be no more use of them in these Matters. Yet were it not better to do *this*; than to be so justly Upbraided, with the (Dishonest) not doing it? How long, do they think, will it secure their Cause; that they combat us with Texts, either wholly of their own Devising, and Unknown to the Antients, or grossly and notoriously perverted in the Translation of them? The Texts alledged by the Unitarians, are all of uncontroverted undoubted Verity; both as to the Reading, and the Translations of them: We have no *Reformed Bibles*; none that have been *Corrected*, to speak the Doctrines of the Church; rather than of the Gospel. But 'tis above Twelve hundred Years, that Others have been Modelling the Common Bibles, by the Doctrines and Articles of our *Holy Mother the Church*: Let us hear one of their own Historians, a Great Opposer of the Unitarians; St. Epiphanius, who wrote above One Thousand and two Hun-

dred Years since. I had rather, that the Reader should be informed of this Matter, in the words of the most Famous Critic of this Age; than in mine: his words are these. "St. Epiphanius, who quotes these words, observes; that *they are found in the Copies that have not been Corrected*. And by this he informs us, that the Grecians have taken the Liberty, to Correct their Copies; and to take away from 'em, that which did not please them. The Orthodox, saith this Father, have *Retrenched these words*. F. Simon. *Crit. Hist. of the New Test.* p. 111, 112. The Place in Epiphanius, to which he refers, and quotes the words, is *Ancor. n. 31*. This bad Zeal of some of the Antients, hath created a great Trouble, to Modern Critics: who, to restore the true and first Readings of the Bible, are constrained to observe very carefully all Citations of Scripture by the Fathers, especially the most Antient; and the Readings of some Antient Copies still remaining, whereof some are held to be near Fourteen hundred Years Old. F. Simon takes a great deal of pains, in divers places of his Works; to establish some Rule of Criticism, whereby to judg of True and False Readings; at length he saith: When the Antient and Present Copies or Readings Differ, the best Rule by which to judg, is that of St. Hilary; namely to consider, which of the Readings are founded on Reason, on History, and on Authority. The Copy, saith he, wherein these things do meet, shall be the Antient and True Reading; whether it be found in Old Manuscripts, or in the printed Books. *Crit. Hist. Part 2. p. 122*. Will our Opposers submit the Texts, controverted between them and us, to this Rule: Shall we judg of the Verity of the Texts, which they Object, and we deny to be Parts of Holy Scripture; by the agreeableness of those Texts to Reason, and to History and Authority? Is it not Evident to all the World, that those Texts imply a Doctrine, most contrary to Reason; which, say they, in this Case and Question, must submit to Revelation: meaning thereby, the

the Revelation made, not to the Evangelists and Apostles; but to the *Correctors and Reformers of our Bibles*? And is it not as Evident, that these Texts are contrary to *Authority and History*; when 'tis confest by All, that the Church for the first Three hundred Years after Christ, had no other Creed but the Apostles? Which our (most Bigotted) Opposers have never dared to deny, to be wholly Unitarian; that is, owning but one Divine Person, even the Father, and speaking of our Saviour as a *Man only*; and finally saying no more of the *Holy Ghost*, than of the *Holy Catholic Church*.

From P. 134. He begins to discourse of the *Satisfaction*; made by the Lord Christ for the Sins of Mankind, by the Oblation and Sacrifice of himself, upon the Cross: because this is a Doctrine that has a Connection, with the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and the *Divinity* of our Saviour. I will not meddle with the (Unconcluding) Reasonings, that his Lordship sometimes uses; it will be sufficient to take notice, that neither the Bishop of Worcester, nor his Lordship, have read the Books of the Socinians upon this Question; for they have wholly mistaken the State of the Question, between the Church and Us. They suppose the Question to be, Whether the Lord Christ was an *Expiatory and Propitiatory Sacrifice* for the Sins of Mankind; and thereupon they set themselves the Task, of Proving what was never Denied by any, that the Lord Christ was *Sacrificium Piaculare*, an Expiatory Sacrifice for Sin.

His Lordship gives three Accounts, of the *Satisfaction* by the Lord Christ. The first is that of the Metaphysicians, School-men, Systematics, and other Writers of Controversy: of this, he intimates his Dislike; and disputes against it; at P. 135, 136. He argues against it, very temperately and modestly; but he should have wholly forbore. For 'tis most certainly the Doctrine of the Catholic Church; as our Opposers call themselves: and 'tis Defective in nothing, I mean in Point of Orthodoxy; saving that his

Lordship hath related it imperfectly, or limited it too much. The second, according to his Lordship, is an Account of the Unitarian Belief concerning the Satisfaction. But he mistakes; in giving only some Part of our Doctrine, for the Whole: We acknowledg those Ends of the Death of Christ, which his Lordship mentions; but we assign also many more, and particularly this, that *Christ died to Expiate the Sins of Mankind*. The third Account is, what his Lordship Believes, in this Matter; and he brings it in, with a *We Believe*: By which, I suppose, is meant, that so his Lordship and the Church Believe. But he was never more out, in relating the Church's Doctrine: 'tis the very Doctrine of the Socinians, which they have owned from the beginning, in all their Books; and against which, so much is written. 'Tis this; "That the Lord Christ was Loaded with all the Ill-usage, that Malicious Men could Invent; that he suffered Unexpressible Agonies both in his Mind and Body, and last of all was Crucified: And that in all this, he willingly Offered himself to Suffer, on our Account. Which was so Accepted by God, that He raised him from the Dead, and gave to him (even as He is Man) all Power both in Heaven and Earth, with respect to the Church; and also Offers to the World Pardon of Sin, on the Conditions of Faith, and Newness of Life. P. 133, 134.

The Socinians have ever professed all this; but it doth not satisfy the Church: We must say much more; or be *Delivered to Satan*. To omit Other, as Bad things, we must say; that the Sacrifice of Christ was an *Equivalent*, in the Scales of the Divine Justice, for all the Infinite Punishments, due by the Divine Law, to all the particular Sinners that ever have been, or shall be. But we cannot say this; his Lordship himself (professedly) Dislikes it, and Argues against it. He denies, P. 135. that the Acts of Christ, tho they were of Infinite Value, which yet he doth not say that they

Wrote,

were, can be understood to correspond to a great many Infinite Guilt, or Infinite Punishments: if there are a great many Infinite Punishments, or Infinite Guilt, to be answered; *one* (supposed) Infinite Satisfaction is not Equivalent, to *all* those Guilt and Punishments, each of which is Infinite. This is a Reasoning, or Computation, that is indeed self-evident; and his Lordship urged it, because it was impossible, a Man of Sense could avoid the Evidence of it. And therefore in giving his Opinion concerning the Satisfaction, by the Lord Christ; he doth not say, with others of his Party, that it was a *strict* or *penary* Satisfaction, but only that God *accepted* it. This is to say, the Sacrifice of Christ was not rendered, to the *Justice* of God, as an Equivalent, Amends, or Reparation; but to his *Mercy*, as a Supplication, and as such *Accepted*. And *thus*, the Socinians not only grant; but contend for. In brief, were the Questions about the Trinity, and the Divinity of our Saviour, adjusted: there would be no longer a Dispute, about the Satisfaction; as his Lordship hath stated it.

Nor, to say true, have we a Controversy with him; about the two former Questions. For, 1. He contents himself to say, *the Three*; and when he says most, *the Holy Three*: disclaiming (expressly) the word *Persons*; in the Sense, says he, that 'tis commonly taken. As for any new and uncommon Sense, it would make *Heir*. Now what is this, but a Negative Faith; or a Belief of Nothing? For to tell us of *the Three*, or *the Holy Three*;

without daring to say *Three what*; is to say nothing at all, or an *Individuum Vagum*. Yet this Cautionness is an Effect, of his Judgment. He had look'd out, and saw the Coast to be full of dangerous Rocks, and Sands: he will not therefore, like other rash Adventurers, put out to Sea; he will rather say nothing, or *what comes to nothing*, than run himself upon Polytheism, or an open Sabellism. 2. Concerning (the other Question) the Divinity of our Saviour; he uses only the Terms of *Naturalis*: that the Divinity did *Inhabit*, or did *Dwell* in the Person of Christ; as among the Israelites, under the Old Testament, it had inhabited *the Cloud of Glory*; which sometimes appeared in the Tabernacle, and afterwards in the Temple. The Socinians allow very well of this; for though they deny, that God was in the *Cloud of Glory*, but only the Angel who represented God, and therefore is called *Jehovah* and God: yet we believe, that God (by his Spirit or Energy) was in the Lord Christ; in a very especial, and powerful Manner. We believe, that God was more perfectly and powerfully in him; than in any former Prophet, or other Messenger of God: and his Lordship will not pretend, that God was so Inhabiting in the Lord Christ; that he was not also, at the same time, in all other Places and Persons. To say all at once; I have not made this Reply, to oppose it to his Lordship's Discourse; but to testify our Respects, to his Lordship; and that we submit to his Doctrine.



*On the Answer to the Animadversions (of Dr. S—th) upon Dr. Sherlock; which Answer is also intitled, The Doctrine of the Trinity placed in its due Light.*

I Believe, the Author of the Answer to Dr. S—th's Animadversions on Dr. Sherlock, will claim to be next heard. And let us hear him; because we may dispatch with him, in very few words.

His Book promises, in the Title of it, to be a Defence of Dr. Sherlock; and consequently, of his *Trithistic Notions*: I verily expected by the Title, that this *New Light* was to have done Wonders, on behalf of Dr. Sherlock. Therefore I was marvellously disappointed, to find; that this Author is no more a Trinitarian, than Dr. S—th himself is, and much less than Dr. Wallis. In comparison of this Author, and of Dr. S—th, we may say; that Dr. Wallis is a right Orthodox Man. For Dr. Wallis saith, *the Three* are somewhat more than *Three Attributes*: but this Gentleman assures us, that *Persons* and *Attributes* are precisely the same; and Dr. S—th makes the Persons to be only *Three Persons*, or equivalent to *Persons*.

We may divide his Discourse, into two Parts: what he saith of the *Trinity*, to page 48; what he saith of the *Incarnation*, to the End of his Book.

Of the *Trinity*, he saith; that being set in its due Light, 'tis no manner of *Mystery*. He acknowledges, that the *Managers* of this Controversy with the Socinians, have made it a *Mystery*; yea and a *Contradiction*: but (saith he, p. 42.) my Hypothesis transfers all the Blame, from the Matter or Doctrine, to the *Managers*; who (by neglecting the Definition of the Subject) turned a Plain Doctrine into a *Mystery*, or a *Plain Contradiction*. And again, he saith p. 48. I have lower'd the great *Mystery* of the *Trinity*, from *Difficult*

yea and *Contradictions*; to Plain and Easy. He forbears not to say, in the last Words of his Book; that he hopes for a *Reward* from the Lord, for what he has written; and the Peace he hath made between the contending Parties.

I pray God; that *Reward* may not be, to give him another sort of *Partis*. For he pretends to be a Trinitarian, argues for three Divine Persons, writes in Defence of a Trithelist; and yet after all, he has let the World see, that he is as very a Socinian, as Lelius or Faustus Socinus were. It would not have become me, to take notice of this; if, to cover his Real Sentiments, he had not so often, and so causlessly spilt in the Faces, of the Socinian Writers. Dr. Wallis and he may go together, as Brethren in this respect: for though they see there is no such Trinity, as the Church holds; and as the Socinians oppose; yet they write against the Socinians as Heretics, they pretend to be of the contrary Party. And this Author cannot write, without *Scurrility* and *Contempt*; nor Dr. Wallis without such (groundless) Calumnies, as are wholly of his own devising. What is the Meaning of this? Why, they would hold their Preferences; and be thought Orthodox: and for the Cause of God, which their Souls approve; they not only say nothing for it, but they would be thought to be against it. But Men are not so deceived; much less is God. Did Dr. Wallis think to perfwade the World, that his Judgment is *Anti-socinian*: when he advanced only such a Trinity, as the Socinians and Sabellians always believed; namely that God is the *Maker*, the *Redeemer*, and

S. Wallis.

*Sanctifier* of Men? And is it less a Mockage of God and Man; that this other Learned Person writes for Dr. *Shirlock*, and the Trinity: and yet he believes no other Trinity in God, but his *Goodness*, his *Wisdom*, and *Power*; as if the Socinians ever denied these Attributes.

I persuade myself, that the Reader who hath not seen this Book will not believe; that a Man should write for the Trinity, and against the Socinians, who believes that those three Attributes are all the Trinity: that is in God. Therefore let us hear his own Words, p. 33. "I plead the positive Assent of the Church of England; that the Three Persons are no more than Three Attributes. Again at p. 46. Who are the Three? They are Three Properties in God. Which so differ; as still to agree, in the same Numerical Nature. *Goodness* in God is Infinite, and therefore is God; the same must be said of *Wisdom*, and *Power*; and yet they are not Three Gods, but One God. Again at p. 40. If you offer the Doctrine of the Trinity in a Rational Scheme; if you tell a Heathen, there is one God, who is infinite in all Perfections; and that all Perfections are reducible to these Three, Infinite *Goodness*, Infinite *Wisdom*, and Infinite *Power*: would the Man boggle at any thing of this? And would not this prepare him for further Instruction, in the Christian Faith: which discovers the several Aspects of these same Three Persons [Goodness, Wisdom, and Power] in order to our Eternal Salvation?

Well, but if the Trinity of Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are only the Three Attributes of *Goodness*, *Wisdom*, and *Power*; then what is the Incarnation? How

was one of these Attributes incarnate in Jesus Christ, and not the other two; and yet Jesus Christ shall be perfect God? For that; 'tis answered, with the turning of a Hand. For he saith, p. 62. "We have seen Two Men (he might have said Three Men, for that was the Case) that were made One Admiration, by a Joint Commission: and we see every day many Men incorporate, into one Political Body, by Patent; whereby they are one Person, in Law. And is this known Sense, are the Godhead and Manhood joined together in one Person; and whereof comes one Christ, very God and very Man. The short then, it should seem, is; that the Incarnation is no more a Mystery, than the Trinity: for Jesus Christ is a God by Commission, or Patent; whereby *Wisdom* (or the second Person) is made one Person, in Law, with the Man Christ Jesus. I hope, the Commission doth not run, *Durante Vita*; or *Durante Beneficio*: 'tis an Absolute, and Irrevocable Patent and Commission; or else as Jesus Christ began to be a God, so we may see him again turned into a mere Man.

I must confess, I did not expect such Accents of his Faith, from this Author: who is not unknown to me. I pray him to consider, who himself is; and much more, who God is: even a Being not to be mock'd, and ridicul'd, by the Worms that he hath made. Concerning whom, if it be not always expedient, to profess (openly) the whole Truth: yet 'tis always necessary, not to affront that Holy Majesty; with our (Affected) Dissimulations; and (Noxious Open) Hypocrisies. But I suppose he may hear of his Book from another Hand; therefore I shall leave him.

## On the Twenty-eight Propositions.

**B**UT here comes an honest Man, who will speak no other ways than he thinks: and who besides that, in all the Travels of his Life, and in the Choice of Opinions, has ever made Reason one of his Guides. He is not for Mysteries, of which Reason can give no Account, of their Self-consistency; and consequently, nor of their Possibility. I know not, why this Eminent Person, who is of the first Order in the Church, has not put his Name, to his Explication. It is the only Explication, that (since the revival of these Questions) may be called Orthodox: He hath avoided the Sabellianism of Dr. Watts, Dr. S—th, Mr. Hooker, and the Author of the Answer to Dr. S—th; nor hath he said any thing that his own Party will reckon to be Trinitarian. In short, 'tis a very dextrous Explication; and only the Unitarians will except against it.

He saith in the Title, that these Propositions are designed, *so to explain the Trinity; as to speak it, not contradictory to Natural Reason.* I will acknowledge that he hath avoided a great many Contradictions; which we charge on the Doctrine of the Trinity, as 'tis held by others: as, all the Natural Contradictions, in the Explication of Mr. Hooker; those which so evidently occur in the Explication, by Dr. Sherlock; all the Follies implied in the Account given by the Schools and Dr. S—th. It is a Possible Scheme, that he has advanced: But tho' he is clear from any Contradictions to Natural Reason, as he speaks; yet besides some Insuperable Difficulties, he hath not been able to avoid some Numerical Contradictions. I reckon, there is a Difference between Natural Contradictions, and Numerical Contradictions: A Natural Contradiction, implies an Inconsistency and Impossibility, in the Nature of the

Thing described, as there described; a Numerical Contradiction, is an Error, committed in the summing up of Things. But to imitate the Brevity of this Learned Person; I will first repeat what he hath said; and then offer the Exceptions, that an Unitarian would make to it. He saith these things.

"Self-Existence is the Highest Perfection.

"No Being is absolutely perfect, if it be not Self-Existent, absolutely Independent, and the first Original of all other Beings.

"Tis a Contradiction, to say; that the Son and Holy Spirit are Beings absolutely Independent, the first Originals of all Things, or Self-Existent.

"Therefore only the Father is God, is the Highest Sense of that word.

"And for this Reason, our Saviour calls the Father, the only True God, John 17. 3. and says further, that He only is Good, Luke 18. 19.

"The Godhead, or God in the Highest Sense, can be but One Numerically; and the Oneness affirmed of him in Scripture, is a Numerical Oneness; and of this, the best Philosophers have been always satisfied, by their Reason.

This is the Sum of the first Thirteen Propositions. One would think, that such a Foundation being laid; the Conclusion must be wholly in favour of the Unitarians. For if the Father is absolutely Perfect, if the Son and Spirit are not absolutely Perfect; both which this Learned Man affirms expressly: How shall we ever prevent this Consequence, therefore only the Father is God? What is the Definition of God among all Divines and Philosophers: is it not this; a Being absolutely Perfect, or a Being that hath all Perfections. But if so, then only the Father having all Perfections, or being absolutely Perfect,

E 2                      fect,

fect, He must be the only God; to the certain Exclusion of the Other Two Persons: to the Exclusion of the Son and Spirit by Name, because 'tis affirmed here of them by Name, that neither of them is *absolutely* Perfect, or hath *all* Perfections.

But this Author will show us, in his following Propositions; that for all *this*, the Son is God, and so also is the Holy Ghost. *That is*, He will put out the Light, of the Sun. He will instruct us, in his *Præmiss*, that there is *but One who is God*; and in the Progress and Conclusion, or in the summing up the whole Reasoning; He will make it appear, that there are Three Beings, each of which is (singly and by Himself) God: which is the *Numerical Contradiction*, that I charged at first on his Hypothesis. But let us hear him. He saith,

1. There seems no Contradiction or Absurdity in supposing, that the *first Original* of all Things (the Father) produced other Beings, so Perfect; that they have *all* Perfections, but only *Self-Existence* and *Independence*, and of being the *first Originals* of all Things.

2. The Holy Scripture speaks of the Son and Spirit, as such Beings. That is, as having *Unlimited Power, Wisdom, and Goodness*; and all other (Divine) Perfections, but *Independence, Self-Existence*, and being the *Originals* of all Things.

3. The same Holy Scripture speaks of the Son and Spirit, as Distinct Beings and Persons (according to the *Proper Signification* of this Word;) both from the Father, and from Each other. Three Men or Three Angels are not more expressly Distinguished, as *Distinct Persons and Substances*; by our Saviour, and the Apostles: than the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are.

I acknowledge in These, and the former Thirteen Propositions, the *genius* Doctrine and very Language of the Fathers who wrote shortly after the Council of Nice, till the Times of the Schoolmen. But the School-Divines, or the Divines of the Middle Ages saw, and almost all the Moderns (who are well-versed

in these Questions) confess it; that this Explanation or Account is an Unexcusable Indefensible *Whimsy*. This is the Explanation, of which the Bishop of Sarum says, P. 98. that "Indeed it is easily apprehended, but seems directly to assert Three Gods, contrary to the most express Declarations of the Old and New Testaments. Indeed my Lord of Sarum doth somewhat otherways represent this Hypothesis; because he had observed that some of the Fathers make an *Inequality* and *Subordination* between the Three Persons: But as to the main Thing in the Hypothesis, or that which maketh the Hypothesis, our present Author and the Bishop of Sarum represent it alike. That is, they understand the Fathers as saying; that the Three Divine Persons, are *Persons* in the *proper* Sense of that Word: which is to say, they are Distinct Intellectual Beings, and have *different Substances* in Number, tho' not in Species or Kind; their Substances, like the Substances of particular Men or Angels, are *Spiritually* the same, and *Numerically* divers and different. But the School-Divines, and (generally speaking) the most Learned of the Moderns, with the greatest Reason in the World abhor *this*; they perceive, that it destroys the True and Real Unity of God: It taketh away his *Proper*, and *Natural*, and *Numerical* Unity, and leaveth only a certain *Political* or *Oeconomical* Unity; which is indeed only an *Imaginary* Unity. The Schools therefore thought themselves obliged, to alter this Hypothesis, into that propounded by Dr. S.—*is*: And because Others have discerned, that the Hypothesis or Explanation of the Schools is a pure Piece of Nonsense; therefore they have changed it, *first* into a Trinity of *Attributes*, others into a Trinity of *External Designations*, and others into other Conceits; yet so as still to keep to the Foundation laid by the *Schoolmen*, that there is *but one Numerical Substance* in God, and that the Attributes and Perfections are not repeated in the *Persons* are, but are as *individual* as the *Substance* or *Nature* is; and in *this*.

this consists the true Difference between the *Fathers* on the one part, and the *Sons* and *Maidens* on the other.

In very deed the Explication of the *Fathers*, revived by the Author of the Twenty eight Propositions, and partly also by Dr. Cadworth; yet so by Dr. Cadworth, as to make it incline to *Arianism*, which the Author of the Propositions hath very judiciously avoided; I say this Explication of the *Fathers*, because it affirms the Three Persons to be Three distinct Intellectual Beings; Three (numerically) different Substances; and moreover that the Son and Spirit have all the *Divine Properties* that the Father hath, but only that they are derived from him as their Cause and Original; therefore this Hypothesis plainly amounts to thus much, that there is one Senior God, and two Juniors. The Hypothesis expressly acknowledges in each of these Persons, first whatsoever Properties that can make them to be distinct Intellectual Beings and Substances; and then, further, all the Attributes that are necessary to constitute a God, that is, to make him be a Perfect God: only it saith, the Father hath this peculiar *Sovereignty* or Privilege, that he was first in the *Order of Nature*. He hath no Essential or Real Perfection more than the other Two Persons; only he hath this Honour, that their Original is from him. 'Tis not possible to say, what are Three Gods; if this be not an Account and Description of Three Gods. It being the Attributes, of Infinite Goodness, Infinite Wisdom, and Infinite Power, that make (if we may so speak) the God: if these are found in Three distinct Beings, Three distinct Substances, as this Hypothesis and Author expressly say; either this is the very Notion of Three Gods, or there is no such thing as all as Trithemism. That one of these is the Senior God, not in Time but only in the Order of Nature, which is to say only in our Conception of Things, is no Real (but only as Imaginary) Perfection. The Perfections of the Deity that are Real, are God's Infinite Wisdom, Power, Goodness, Duration, and such-like;

therefore the Son and Spirit are Gods, in the highest Sense of that Word, if they have all those (afore said) real and positive Perfections of the Divine Nature; tho' it be granted at the same time, that they are Originated from the first Person.

A Father begets two Sons, that have all the Properties of the Human Nature, in as great Perfection as their Father: shall we deny that they are Men, in the highest Sense of that Word; because they are Originated from their Father; Are not Abel and Seth as truly Men, in the highest Sense of that Word, as their Father Adam? This is the very Case before us; for here is an Almighty, Omnipotent and most Good Father, who on the Account of those his Attributes (Almightiness, Omniscience, and perfect Goodness) is called God; from him there is generated and hath proceeded a Son and Spirit, qualified as he is, that is to say, each of them is Omnipotent, Omniscient, and most Good: therefore (say I) they are Gods in as perfect and high a Sense, as the Father is, notwithstanding their being Originated from him; even as Abel and Seth are Men in as perfect and high a Sense, as their Father Adam, tho' Originated from him. As all the Difference, in one of the Cases, is, that Adam is the Senior Man; Abel and Seth are Juniors, both in Time and Order of Nature: So all the Difference of the other Case, is, that the Father is the Senior God, the Son and Spirit are Juniors, in the Order of Nature.

The Fathers turned themselves all manner of ways, to avoid this Demonstration; which they saw was obvious to every one: but their Answers are meer Subtilties, and Finesses. The most Learned Person with whom we are now Arguing, rejecting (or omitting) all other Answers of the Fathers to this Objection, takes up with what was most common and current among 'em; even this. Altho, saith he, we cannot understand, how it should be no Contradiction to affirm, that the Three Persons are but one numerical Being, or Substance yet it hath not the least Shadow of a Contradiction.



addition, to suppose; that there is an *intentionally close Union* both in Will and Nature, between them. And such an Union may be much more easily conceived between them, than can that *Union* which is between our Souls and Bodies; since *these* are Substances of unlike and even contradictory Natures.

In these few words consist the Strength and Hopes of this Explication. *The intentionality close Union in Will, and Nature, between the Three Gods, makes 'em to be One God.* He had said, the Three Persons are Three distinct Intellectual Beings; they are Three distinct Substances; they are Persons, in the most proper Sense of that word; they are as distinct and divers, as *Three Sons to Three Angels*; and each of them is Allmighty, All-knowing, and most Good: And yet after all this, in summing up the Account, they are All made to be One God; by *that most perfect Union in Will, and Nature.* That is, they are One God, by that very thing which most inconceivably declares them to be Three Gods. For what is the Union of

Will and Nature, between distinct Intellectual Beings, and Different Substances: is it any other but this, in Plain English, that they *always will the same things*; and their Natures and Substances are united in the same Properties, Attributes or Perfections? *that is to say*, these Three Intellectual Substances and Beings, are each of them Almighty, Omniscient, most Good, and the rest. Why this is the very thing, that makes them to be Three Gods. If the Son and Spirit *willed* contrary to the Father, they should not be Gods; for by *willing* contrary to him who is confessedly God, they should show their *Ignorance*, or their *Pravosity*, and consequently that they are not Gods: and if they had not the *same Attributes and Perfections* that make him to be a God, neither could they be Gods, as He is.

How is it possible, that this most Discerning Author should over-look such an obvious Reasoning; or not be satisfied with it? All we can say in the Case, is, *Allegiance to our mortal Nature.*

## On Mr. H.-W.

**M**r. H.-W., an Enthusiast Divine of the Presbyterian Way, has thought fit to publish *A Calm Discourse, concerning the Possibility, of a Trinity in God*; together with some *Lectures* on Dr. Wallis, on the same Argument. The *Lectures* are full of *High Compliments*, and most *Profuse Sincere* flattery to: (the Oracle of Wit and Learning) Dr. Wallis. Which from a *Trinitarian* (writing for a *Real Trinity*): to a *Sabellian* contending for a *Nominal Trinity*, was much more than needed, or could be (reasonably) expected. Dr. Wallis is a very lucky Man, to be courted and extolled to that degree, by a Person *above* him, and dissenting so *widely* from him: unless Mr. H.-W. meant, that his *Lectures* should be

taken only as *Flattery or Railery*; or would hereby engage Dr. Wallis, to do as much for him.

The *Discourse* and *Lectures* are both written in long Periods, full of Parentheses and Digressions; which (together) make them very difficult and perplex to the Reader: But this Blemish in the Style and Composition, notwithstanding, the Notions and the Reasonings offer'd by the Author, show him to be a Man of (more than ordinary) judgment and Learning: We must say more, he has *seen further* into these Questions than any of the Authors, with whom we have been hitherto concerned, even than the Author of the Twenty eight Propositions.

Mr. H—w. 'tis not enough for Men, to cry *Mystery, Mystery*: as if a Presence of *Mystery* could warrant, or could defend, contradictory and impossible Doctrines. He has not, with the Bishops of *Worcester* and *Sarum*, thought it sufficient to make a (superfine) Declaration for Mysteries; that is, against the Use of a Man's Reason in Religion, where it ought to be most of all employed: because nothing can be offer'd of that kind, but will be as applicable to the (good old) Mystories of the Transubstantiation, and Consubstantiation, and a hundred more such like. He is for finding the Possibility of the Thing, or he will give it up: he is sensible, that the Composition of our Understandings is such; that while we apprehend a Contradiction, or what is the same, an Impossibility in a Doctrine or Thing, we do not (we cannot) believe such Thing or Doctrine, even while we pretend to believe it.

He says, that the *Nominal* Trinitarians, who so believe Three Persons in the Godhead, as to intend that Word in a *Civil* and *Religious* Sense, not in a *Rational* and *Natural*, are in very deed no other but *Unitarians*. Therefore he tells Dr. Wallis expressly, though (always) in Terms fit to be used to an Emperor; that he falls in with the *Anti-trinitarians*, and that his Notion of Persons will make us all to be *Unitarians*, so he saith p. 103. And 'tis of other *Nominal* Trinitarians, such as the School-men, Dr. S—th, Mr. Hooker, &c. that we are to understand what he saith at p. 12. they so diminish the Distinction of the Three Persons, as to make it near to Nothing: that is, in very deed they leave but one Divine Person, who is a *Rational* subsisting Person; which is the thing, the Unitarians would have. He hath a judicious Observation hereupon, at p. 192. They take away the Grounds of the Doctrines of the Incarnation, and the Satisfaction. For in truth, the Sabellian or *Nominal* Trinitarians, as Doctor *Cudworth* hath called them, make themselves perfectly ridiculous; when they come to apply their Hypothesis, to the Incarnation and the Satisfaction. Dr. Wallis,

Mr. Hooker, Dr. B. Dr. S—th, what can these say of the Incarnation, or Satisfaction? How was Doctor Wallis's Redemption, or Mr. Hooker's Property to be of his Father, or Dr. B's Assurance of *Wisdom*, or Dr. S—th's Person, incarnate; or how can it be said to satisfy for the Sins of Men, by undergoing Punishment in our Steads? Mr. H—w saw these Straits of the *Nominal* Trinitarians; he is therefore of another Party: all his Admiration of Dr. Wallis's Person and Wit, hinders not; but that he perceives, he hath given up these Doctrines implicitly, and the Doctrine of the Trinity directly, to the Unitarians.

He says, what the *Real* Trinitarians, of which Party he is, have not seen. He perceiveth that Dr. Hooker's *Natural* Conscience, and self-consciousness, can by no means make the (supposed) Divine Persons to be One God; because this Hypothesis leaves out the *Nexus*, as he speaks, that is, the Connexion by which the said Persons may be united. Self-consciousness and Mutual-consciousness, saith he, are at most but an Effect of their Union, not the Nexus (or Union) itself by which they are One God. The Author of the 28 Propositions perceiveth, there must be a Nexus (as Mr. H—w speaks) whereby to make the Three Persons to be One God; but he hath thought of such a one as Mr. H—w will certainly reject: for an Union of Will (which is nothing else but a Conformity of Will, or those Persons willing the same thing) and an Union of Nature (which he maketh to be nothing but this, that the Three supposed Persons are alike most Gods, and infinitely Wise and Powerful) these are not only, not a Nexus (or true Union) but are the very Things that must be united, or the Things for which we seek a Nexus.

Well, so many able Artists have failed; we grant, he hath seen their Mistakes: afterwards will he himself make a Coat for the *Deus*? Will he offer an Hypothesis or Explication, that shall fit the Doctrine of the Trinity, and withal those of the Incarnation and the Satisfaction?

*jection*: an Hypothesis that shall neither run him; on the *Sylla* of *Sabellianism*, which (he owns) is but another Name of Unitarianism; nor on the *Charydis* of *Tritheism* or Three Gods, which hitherto has not been avoided by the *Real Trinitarians*, no more than the other by the *Nominal Trinitarians*. Let us take a View of his Hypothesis; which we must fetch from several parts of his Book.

He saith p. 110, 111. "The Persons are distinct *Essences*; p. 112. they are distinct *Numerical Natures, Beings, and Substances*; p. 140. there is a *Variety of Individual Natures, in the Deity*. P. 126. There are in the Godhead Three distinct Intelligent *Hypostases* (or Persons) having each his own distinct *singular Intelligent Nature*. P. 55. "These Three Divine Persons (Beings, *Essences, Natures, Substances*) maintain a *Delicious Society*. No Enjoyments being pleasurable, without *Communication* therein; and we must needs think, this is a more Blessed State, or a more Perfect Idea of *Blessedness*; than can be conceived as an *Eternal Solitude*. Every one sees, that this (hitherto) is Dr. *Sherlock's* Doctrine; only with some more *gross* Ideas, and Additions to it. But let us also hear the rest.

As to that Question; if each of these Persons and Beings is God; how can it be said, that all *Three* are but One God? He replies, p. 31. Each of the Three Persons conceived by it self, is an *individual Essence*; but conceived together, they are the *intire Essence of God*. P. 35. Neither Father, Son, nor Spirit, taken separately, is God; but all these together. P. 47. If you predicate the term *God*, of any one of these Three Persons, you give an *Inadequate* (i. e. an *incomplete*) Notion of God: 'tis indeed said, the Father is the only true God; but this must be understood, as not excluding the Son and Spirit. P. 117. Each of these Persons, partaking of the Divine Nature, gives us but an *Inadequate*; but all of them together, a most Perfect, Intire, and Adequate Notion of God.

Again, to this other Question; if there are Three Divine *Essences, Substances, Beings*, really *subsisting* Persons; so really divers and several, that 'tis a main Part of their *Blessedness*, that they maintain a *Delicious Society and Conversation with one another*; by what possible *Nexus* can they be made to be One God? He answers at p. 18. The Vegetative, Sensitive, and Intellectual *Natures* in Man, are *distinct, divers, and several*; and yet they are united, and make one *Man*. And again he saith; "Every Man is made up of two distinct *Natures*, Body and Soul, united into one Man." P. 19. These two *Natures* in Man (the Body and Soul) are very *unlike*; but if God could unite into one, two such *contrary* Natures: let any Man give me a Reason, why he might not (much more) first make, and then unite two *Spirits*; and if two, why not *three*; so unite them, that for all that (like the Soul and Body) they shall remain *distinct*? P. 23. But if there may be such an Union, of Three *created* Spirits; what hinders, but that we may conceive also such an Union, with such *Distinction*, between *uncreated* Spirits: an Union that has not been made in Time, but was *Original and Eternal*? *Hm, by the way, we may observe; that he holds the Three Persons, to be Three Spirits, as well as Three Persons.*

The *Bottom* of this Hypothesis, is the true Strength of it; and without that, himself will not deny, that all the rest is a most obvious, and a most certain *Tritheism*: therefore let us begin our Remarks, at this End of his Explication.

The Censure that Dr. *Sherlock* has made (in his Postscript to his late Defence against Dr. *H—w*) of this Explication by Mr. *H—w*, is this: that "'Tis such a Notion of the Unity of God, as neither the Scriptures, nor the Ancient Church, knew any thing of; and that there is little need to confute it. Yet he bestows a Confutation upon it; to which Mr. *H—w* has replied: I shall leave 'em to dispute it out; saying

saying only this. That as Mr. H—w found the Tricheism of Dr. Sherlock's Explanation; by (rightly) observing that it wanted a *Mean*, whereby the Three Gods might become One God: so Dr. Sherlock will discover the Tricheism of Mr. H—w's Explanation, by showing; that Three individual *Divine Natures* and *Essences* can possibly have no *Mean*, whereby to become *an* *Divine Nature*, and at the same time (as Mr. H—w's Hypothesis supposes) remain still *Three* individual *Divine Essences* and *Natures*: Verily, if Dr. Sherlock cannot prove this; he can prove nothing. But as I said; let 'em contest it out, between themselves.

The Question between Mr. H—w, and the Socinians, is; How Three (distinct, several, individual) *Divine Beings*, *Essences* or *Substances*, should remain *Three* several individual *Substances*, and yet at the same time be united into *one* *Divine Substance*, called God? Mr. H—w answers, first; the Vegetative, Sensitive, and Intellectual *Natures* in Man, are distinct and several, and yet are united into *one* *Humane Nature*, or *one* *Man*. That is, he forgets, that the *Question* is concerning the Union of *Persons* and *Substances*; and his *Answer* is concerning such *Natures*, as are neither *Persons* nor *Substances*. For no Man ever pretended, nor will he pretend; that the Vegetative, Sensitive, and Intellectual *Faculties* (or *Power*s) in the *Humane Nature*, are so many distinct individual *Persons*, *Substances*, or *Essences*. We grant, that the *Three* mentioned *Faculties* are distinct in Man's *one* *Nature*: but what is *this* to *Three* *Substances* or *Persons*, or *Essences*, being united into *one* *Substance* or *Essence*? and besides that, remaining still *Three* *Essences* and *Substances*? To make out the Parallel, Mr. H—w must say; the Vegetative, Sensitive, and Intellectual *Substances* or *Essences* in Man, are united into *one* *Essence* and *Substance*, and still remain *Three* *Essences* and *Substances*: when I hear him say so, it will be to the purpose; but 'tis too apparently false in all the Parts of it, for him to dare ever to say it.

But he answers again; the *Body* and *Soul* (which are *two* *Substances*) are united into *one* *Man*. And if there is this Union between such *contrary* *Natures* and *Substances*, as the *Soul* and *Body*; why may there not be a like Union, between two or three *created* *Spirits*: and if between three *created* *Spirits*; why not between three *incorrupt* *Spirits*? Here again he forgets the *Question*; the *Question* is, How shall *Three* *intelligent* *Substances* and *Essences* be united, into *One* *Substance* and *Essence*? His Answer is, as the *Soul* and *Body* are united. Why, Sir, first, are *Body* and *Soul* *intelligent* *Substances*; as the *Three* (preceded) *Divine Persons* each of them are? or, are *Body* and *Soul* united into *one* *Substance*, as those other *Three* are? Do not *Body* and *Soul* remain *two* *Substances* and *Essences*, a *Bodily* and a *Spiritual*; notwithstanding their Concurrence to the Constitution of a *Man*? Does Mr. H—w think, that the Socinians are so inobservant, that they need to be informed by him, that three (or three Thousand) *Substances* may be *supposed* together into *some* *one* *Thing*; and yet remain as distinct as they were before? or that we question, whether a *Soul* can *subside* a *Humane Body*? Are we such negligent Considerers, that we want to be told, there may be a Composition (or whatever more favourable Name you will give it) of *divers* *Substances* into *some* *one* *Thing*, of *another* Name and *Nature* from any of those particular *Substances*; and yet those *Substances* remain distinct and diverse? He thinks, we have never *seen* a *Christmas-Pye*; where the *Plum*, *Meat*, *Sugar*, *Wine*, and other *Substances* are *distinct* *Substances*, and yet are united into *one* *Pye*. The *Thing* that we want to know, is; how *Three* *intelligent* *Essences* or *Substances* can be united into *one* *intelligent* *Essence* or *Substance*, and yet still be *Three* *intelligent* *Substances* or *Essences*? The Instance of *Soul* and *Body*, is far from this; the *Body* being *no* *intelligent* *Substance*; nor the *Soul* and *Body* made into *one* *Substance*; much less (as Mr. H—w's Case requires)

Into one Substance or Essence of the same *Flow* and *Nature* with either of them, and yet still remaining Two individual Substances or Essences.

But besides, that the Ground of his Hypothesis, appears thus to be a meer Overfight and Incogirance: there are many other (dangerous) things, in this Explication of Mr. *H—w*; of which he will never be able, to give a Tolerable, or so much as a Consistent Account.

1. What can we make of that *Delicious Society*, between Three Divine Persons; of which (it may be) he is the first that ever dreamt? I doubt, whether ever any *Deity* before Mr. *H—w*, durst pretend such an *Altinity* and *Diversity*, in the Deity; as to introduce Three *Qualisive* Almighty Beings and Spirits, as he expressly calls them, Associating, Discouraging, and Solacing with one another: if this be not to make Three Gods, 'tis impossible to imagine what are Three Gods; and it can never be made appear, that the Pagans and Heathens held more Gods, if this Account do not imply more Gods. Conversation, Confociation, mutual Harmony, Agreement, and Delectation; which are his very words; cannot be conceived, but between Beings so distinct and diverse, that they can be *One* in no *Natural* Respect, but only in a *Civil* and *Oeconomical*: I will adventure to say, that Mr. *H—w* hath here so much over-shot his Mark; that no Learned Divine of any Perswasion, will subscribe to his Doctrine.

2. But he saith further, neither Father, Son, nor H. Spirit are *separately* (or *by himself*) God, in an Adequate Sense of the word God; but only All of them together. I omit, that this is *Heresy*, among those of his own Party; whether they be the *Nominal* or *Real* Trinitarians: who all agree, that each of the Divine Persons is Perfect God, in the most Adequate and Perfect Sense; and this too, as such Person is considered *separately*, or as the Athanasian Creed speaks *by himself*. We are compelled, *saith* that

*God*, by the Christian Verity, to confess; that each of these Persons *by himself* (or *separately*) is God and Lord. I say: I will omit this; but how can it be over-look'd, that if neither Father, Son, nor Spirit is God, in an Adequate or Perfect Sense, neither can all Three together be God. Three *Finite* can never make an *Infinite*; nay no determinate Number of *Finite*s, how great so ever the Number is, can make an *Infinite*. I ask, is the *Father* infinite in his Substance, in his Wisdom, his Power, his Goodness; or is he not? If he is; he is God in the most Adequate and Perfect Sense of the word *God*; but if he is not, if he is defective in any of these, as Mr. *H—w* supposes; Three such (Defective) Persons as he, can never make a Perfect God, or a God Infinite in all those Perfections; because Three *Finite* (or Three thousand *Finite*) Substances, Wisdoms, Powers, Goodnesses, do not amount to, or make *an* Infinite Substance, Wisdom, Power, or Goodness.

For the rest of Mr. *H—w*'s Book, namely the Texts that he has alledged for the Doctrine of the Trinity: I hope, I may say without Vanity, I have given a full Answer to them in the Reply to Mr. *Milburn*; to which therefore I refer.

Thus at length we are gone thorow with another Set, of Accounts and Explications of the (pretended) Trinity; and have seen, that neither are the Accounts themselves justifiable, nor do the Authors of them forbear to condemn one another, either of *Trithism*, or of *Sublissimism*; which is to say, of *Three Gods*; or else of the *Sacrosanct* Doctrine, disguised in dark or absurd Words.

The Bishops of *Worcester* and *Sarum*, are for a Trinity. But my Lord of *Worcester* will not say, a Trinity of *Whats*: And my Lord of *Sarum*'s Explication of the Trinity, is, *the Three*, when he is among special Friends, he ventures to say, *the Holy Three*. But *this* being to believe Nothing at all, the rest despise it, and give forth particular Explications.

The



The Author of the *Trinity* placed in it the *Light*, *Truth*; the *Three Persons* (so much talk'd of) are only the *Three Attributes*; of *Goodness*, *Wisdom*, and *Power*: and for this, he touches the Authority of the Church of *England*. But it is a meer Mockery; and this Gentleman had no more Cause to write for the *Trinity*, than Dr. *Smith*, and less than Dr. *Wallis*. He should have forbore to affront God and Man, with his (too notorious) *Disquisitions*, in *Questions* and *Debates* of so great Concernment.

The Author of the *Twenty eight Propositions*, and Mr. *H-w*, are honest Men, and real *Trinitarians*: but the former having assigned no *Nexus*, whereby to make his *Three Gods* to be one God, but only that

Agreement of their *Wills*, and those *Attributes* and *Perfections* of their *Natures*, which so evidently suppose them to be (not One, but) *Three Gods*; his Hypothesis is not, in that respect, so detestable as Mr. *H-w*. But Mr. *H-w*, as he saw there must be a *Nexus*; so he durst not venture to say, what the *Nexus* is, but only explains the possibility of it, by the *Nexus* or Union between the Soul and Body. On the contrary, I have minded him; that the Union of the Soul and Body, is altogether unlike to that in the (supposed) *Trinity*. Because neither is the Body an *Intelligent Substance*; nor are the Soul and Body united (or possibly can be) into one *Substance* or *Essence*, as is affirmed of the *Trinity*.

### In Answer to his Grace the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury.

I may need some Apology, that a Man should undertake to Answer, and in one short Book, to so many most Learned Men: some of them of the first Order in the Church; and yet not more eminent for their Dignity, than for their Real Worth, and Excellent Learning. But it will seem to be meer Petulance, and Arrogance, that we could not forbear (so they will speak of it) the very Sermons of the Arch-Bishop: who might have been heard, with Respect, and without answering again; if it were but upon this Consideration, that he is the Common Father of the Nation, and has instructed the Socinians themselves with the Air and Language of a Father, not of an Adversary or a Judge.

I shall readily acknowledge all this; even the Merits and Erudition of my Lords the Bishops, and Others, who have written on this Argument: and that it has the appearance of ill-manners, and a bad sort of Spirit; to be forward to answer again to *Epistles* and *Powers*, as the Holy Scriptures call

our just Superiours. As for the Arch-Bishop, the Socinians are concerned for their own Reputation, to reverence his Person, and Admonitions: because 'tis agreed among all good Men, or that but profess to be such, that he is respected and lov'd by All, but those that are also known to hate their Country; he hath no other Maligners, but the Enemies of their Nation: it self. On these Considerations, we have been silent a long while, even some Years, in which some of the Discourses here answered have been published. But the Authors of them will please to consider, that 'tis a very hard thing, and in the Cause of God a thing very blameable, to resist the Challenges, made from so many Places and Hands, by occasion of these Sermons and Discourses. Why do you not answer to the Bishop of *Worcester*? What can you say to the Sermons of the Arch-Bishop? See here an unanswerable Discourse, by the Bishop of *Sarum*; the Bishop of *Gl.* has stop't your Mouths, with his *Twenty eight Propositions*; and to how many other Learned Men,

have you not dared to make any Reply? I am very well content, that these Gentlemen should have all the Esteem and Reputation that is implied in these Honours, and Favourites of their Party. I do not envy them any Part of their Honour; but shall always do my part, when the Occasion will admit of it, to promote and increase it. But I am not willing, it should be thought, by occasion of our Silence and Respect, that they have indeed proved, that there are *True Gals*; which is the true Purport of some of their Explications, even of all the *Real Trinitarians*. Or that it should be thought, that this Calumny is not (in effect) *given up to us*, by the Explications of Others of them, namely of all the *Nominal Trinitarians*; such as Dr. S—th, Dr. Wallis, Mr. Hooker, and those that tell us only of *True Attributes*, or not of so much, but only the *True*, or the *Holy True*.

Besides, were the Dignity of some of these our Opposers greater than it is, yet the *Common-Wealth of Learning* owns none of these Titles, Dean, Bishop, Arch-Bishop, and such-like; it has no regard for 'em. *That Great Republic* esteems all Men, by only their Performances, to what they undertake to maintain, or to oppose: *She* serves but only to make a Man ridiculous, to character or with himself, by any of the (specious) Titles or Advantages of this World; by his *Fortune*, and not by his *Merits*. If I have really removed, or help'd to remove, the *Darks*; that the Men of *Apostasy* would bring into Religion: If I have effectually proved, that the *most* of 'em have *given up their Cause* to us; and that the rest neither have, nor can defend it, without falling into *Trifles*, which is to say, without revolting from Christianity, to Paganism. I say, if this be in very deed the Case; it will avail my Opposers nothing, nor blench us at all, that they are great *Professors of the World*, and I am *free of their Blasts*. For 'tis certain, we have a mighty Propensity, to believe as is for our Interest and Turn. Men will persuade themselves to a great

deal, only to be quiet; but if you bribe 'em too, with great Rewards, what will they not say, what will they not do? But the Church has taken a farther Care, to keep her Sons in the right Way; for the Fears and Awe the proposer, are even greater than her *Bribe*. For as they who bestow their Children upon the Church, reckon they are amply provided for, in the Care and Favour of so Wealthy a Mother; and therefore seldom give those Children any farther Inheritance; so this is the occasion, that these adopted Sons, should they do or affirm anything, contrary to the Commands, or the Declarations of the Church, they are sure to *lose*, because they are sure to be cast out. I think therefore, 'tis no immediately to say, that our Opposers being under the Power of such fatal *Bias*; their Doctrine is the more to be suspected, and more *fitly* to be examined, *because 'tis theirs*. They are great Men indeed, every way Great, that defend against us the Doctrine of the Trinity; but then, 'tis that they *must* maintain it: set 'em at Liberty, discharge them of their Awe and Fears; let the Church-Preferrments be proposed as the Rewards of only Learning and Piety, as they were first intended, not of holding *this* or *that* particular Opinions and Doctrines; and it shall be soon seen, how many Eyes this Liberty would open. All the *Nominal Trinitarians*, who are the greater Number, would declare for us, the very first Day; and for the *Real Trinitarians*, which Men of Sense and Wit may see, they soon will see. But to spend no more time, in Prefacing; and asking also Pardon, if there be any thing here said, not respectful enough.

We have Four Sermons of His Grace, the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, preached in the Years 1679, and 1680, and published 1693. The Doctrine of the Divinity of our Saviour, has a necessary connexion with that of the *Trinity*; and till one knows what Opinion a Writer has concerning the Trinity, we cannot

cannot tell in what Sense he holds our Saviour is God: But his *Grace* is very open and ingenuous, in declaring his Opinion of the Trinity; it appears clearly, that he is of the Number of the *Real Trinitarians*. He so holdeth a Trinity of Divine Persons, as to understand the word Persons in the usual and vulgar sense: He hath not devised nor compiled with a Notion of the word Persons, that may set aside (in effect) the Doctrine of the Trinity; as the *Schools*, and other *Nominal Trinitarians* do.

His words are these, at p. 120. "Here I fix, that there are *Three Differences* in the Deity, of which the Scriptures speak by the Names of *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; and further speak also every where of them, as we use to do of *Three distinct Persons*: therefore I see no Reason, why we should nicely abstain from using the word *Persons*; tho' I remember that St. *Jerom* does somewhere desire to be excused from it.

This is plain and fair Dealing; and I allow hereupon, that his *Grace* has a Right to alledge particular Scriptures, to prove the Divinity of our Saviour, in the Sense that 'tis believed by the *Catholic Church* so called: which thing no *Nominal Trinitarian* has a right to do; because 'tis evident that the *Nominal Trinitarian* can hold the Divinity or the Incarnation of our Saviour in no other sense, but as the *Socinians* hold it; namely, that God did *inhale* in the Person of the Lord Christ, by an extraordinary Presence, and Exertion of his Power in him, incomparably greater than in former Prophets.

He hath chosen for his Argument, or Text, *John* 1. 14. *The Word was made Flesh, and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father*. But he taketh in and urgeth the whole Context; and often expresses his Opinion to this effect: that this Context is a most indubitable and most clear Proof, of the Divinity of our Saviour; by which he means, that the Lord Christ is *Co-eternal*, and *Co-equal* (in Power and other Divine Attributes) to God his Father. And

whereas the *Socinians* expound the Expressions in this Context, so as to make it so say only; that Christ is here so called God, as *Moses, Solomon*, and others are called Gods in other parts of H. Scripture; and that the Creation here imputed to him, is only the *New Creation*, that is the Renovation of the World from Idolatry and Paganism: he answers in this manner, at p. 76. "That there is no end of Wit and Fancy, which can turn any thing into any thing; and can make whatsoever they please to be the Meaning of any Book, though never so contrary to the very Design of the Book.

In the foregoing Page he saith, one may in like manner interpret the first Chapter of *Genesis*, to be meant only of the *New Creation*; as well as the *Socinians* interpret the first Chapter of St. *John*, to that Sense and Purpose. "One may say, that is the Beginning is to be understood, of the Beginning of the *Mosaical Dispensation*; and the Creation of *Heaven and Earth*, shall be only the Institution of the Jewish *Polity* and Religion; and the *Chaos or Darkness* shall signify the State of Darkness and Ignorance, in which the World was before the giving of the Law by *Moses*: In a word, that whole Chapter may be allegoriz'd by a dextrous Wit, so as to intend only the *New Creation*; as easily as the First of St. *John* is, by the *Socinians*.

In short, he saith these *two* things: 1. That this Context is very clear, for the Divinity of our Saviour; he repeateth this often, and magnifies it as a most weighty Consideration. 2. That the contrary Interpretation by the *Socinians*, is only Fancy and Wit; and as applicable to the first Chapter of *Genesis*, or to any other Writing or Book.

1. That this Context is most clear, for the Divinity of our Saviour. By the Divinity of our Saviour, or the Son, his *Grace* means; that the Son was *Co-eternal*, and *Co-equal* (in Power and all other Divine Attributes) with God his Father. And yet I believe,

believe, at least I do not remember it, the *Fathers* who have treated of these Questions, made not this Judgment, of this Context. They did not alledge the Expressions of this Context, that are alledged by his *Grace* and the Moderns; against their Opposers the *Arians*: they were aware, that the Expressions here used will not amount, upon their *armost* Stretch; to more than the *Arians* contended for. The *Arians* said; "there is  
"but *One* God, but *One* who was from Ever-  
"lasting, or who is Omnipotent; he hath  
"none that are *Co-eternal* or *Co-equal* to  
"him: but *some* time before the World was  
"made, he generated (after an ineffable  
"unspeakable Manner) *the Son*; to be his  
"Instrument and Minister in digesting *Original Matter* into Order, or to make or  
"frame the World, according to the Model  
"that God should give him. This *Son* is  
"called *God* in Scripture; not because he  
"is the most High God, or God is the most  
"Perfect Sense of that word; but being the  
"Maker of the World and of the Creatures  
"in it, he is a God with respect to them:  
"there is but *one* God, and but *one* Crea-  
"tor, in the proper and strict Sense of those  
"Words; but the Son and Spirit being  
"pre-existent some time to the World,  
"and being the Ministers of God to dispose  
"Matter or Bodies into the Order designed  
"by God, in a word to *make* (though not  
"to *disfigure* or *contrive*) the World, there-  
"fore they also are called in Scripture  
"Gods and Creators in this lower Sense of  
"the Word. By this Explication, the *Arians*  
"seemed to themselves to gain these  
"two Points; First, that they preserved the  
"(sacred inviolable) Unity of the only True  
"God, as our Saviour speaks, which they  
"saw and confessed was the grand Design of both  
"the Testaments: Secondly, they hereby fully  
"satisfied all the Scripture-Expressions, to  
"trouble some to the other Unitarians, which  
"call our Saviour a God (never, the God, by  
"way of Excellence) and impute to him the  
"Creation of the World. I say now, this  
"first Chapter of St. John, is with great Co-

lour alledged for the Arian Doctrine; but  
"most imperitiously for the Trinitarian,  
"which it doth not favour, no not in the  
"least. The Trinitarian Doctrine is this;  
"that the Son is so God, as to be *Co-eternal*  
"(or from Everlasting) with the Father; and  
"that he is *Co-equal* to the Father, in Power  
"and all other Divine Attributes. How is this  
"Doctrine proved, out of this Context of St.  
"John; which doth not so much as intimate  
"any such thing. His *Grace* himself, when  
"he comes to interpret the particular Ex-  
"pressions, can raise 'em no higher than Ari-  
"anism; though he alledged them, to prove  
"Trinitarianism. He saith, p. 20. *In the Be-*  
"ginning here is as much as to say, *when things*  
"began to be made; and again at p. 35. *In the*  
"Beginning, that is, the Son already *was* when  
"things began to be created. I ask now, is  
"this to prove the *Co-eternity*, or that the Son  
"was from Everlasting; doth it prove any  
"more than Arianism, that the Son was ge-  
"nerated some time before the World?

But though he cannot find the *Co-eternity*  
"in the Words of St. John; yet he can inter-  
"pret his own Interpretation of St. John's  
"Words, so as to make out the *Co-eternity*.  
"For in the Pages before cited he saith; *In*  
"the Beginning, that is, the Son already *was*,  
"when Things began to be: and by consequence,  
"the Son was without a Beginning, for that which  
"was never made, could have no Beginning of its  
"Being. How, Sir, is that a good Consequence;  
"or any Consequence at all? For supposing the Son *was*, when the World  
"began to be; which is not yet Six thousand  
"Years ago: will it follow, that therefore he  
"was absolutely without a Beginning, or was never  
"made? He might sure be generated or  
"made in the Latitude of Eternity, in some  
"Duration (though we have no Period by  
"which to denominate that Duration) before  
"the World, and yet be not much *senior* to  
"the World; as the *Arians*, and (most of  
"the) *Amenicene Fathers* held, by Confession  
"of D. Petavius and others of the more  
"Learned and Ingenuous of our Opposers.

There

There are several such Interpretations of this first Chapter of St. John's Gospel, given by the Unitarians, particularly by *H. Gratus*, and the Author of the Br. History of the Unitarians; that it would do no Service to his Grace's Design, though we should grant him what he here contends for, that in the *Beginning* here, is as much as to say *without Beginning*: yet it was proper for me, to observe, that he had no Reason to say, that this Context militates for the Divinity of our Saviour, as 'tis now understood and held; because (as I have shown) the very utmost that can be (possibly) made of this Context, is only the *Aeternall* (not the *Co-eternal*) Existence of the Son. And he can less prove from hence that *Omnipotence*, or other Divine Attributes, belong to our Saviour; because though the Arians interpret the *Making of the World and of all things*, to be the Making of Heaven and Earth: yet neither they, nor the Context, can be wrested to mean thereby, any more than this; that *primæval Matter* was made into the Form which we call the *World* by the Son, as the Instrument and Minister of God, and according to the Archetype or Model designed and appointed by God.

Briefly, in opposition to his Grace's Proposition, that this Context is most clear for the Divinity of our Saviour; meaning thereby, that he is *Co-eternal* and *Co-equal* with God his Father: I (humbly) answer, that neither were the *Fathers* of this Sentiment, in their Disputes with the Arians; nor in very deed can the Context be raised, to speak more than Arianism; for it affirms only, in its utmost Stretch, the *Aeternall* (not the *Pre-eternal*) Existence of our Saviour, and that he was the *Minister of God* to digest *Primæval Matter*, into its present Order.

2. That the Interpretation of this Context by the Socinians, is only Invention, Fancy and Wit; and is as applicable to the first Chapter of *Genesis*, or to any other Writing or Book, as to this first Chapter

of St. John. But let his Grace put the Case, as it really is; and I am content to join Issue with him, upon the Instance he hath here given. He saith, the first Chapter of *Genesis* may as well be interpreted of only the *New Creation*, or new Modelling of things in Heaven and on Earth; as the first Chapter of St. John. The first Chapter of St. John speaks of a certain Person, namely of the Lord Christ, who is confessed to have been a Man; and yet it saith of him, *all things were made by him*; and again, *the World was made by him*. Hereupon, the Socinians think it were a wild Extravagance, to imagine more Gods, or New Creators; contrary to the Tenor and the Design of both the Testaments: therefore, say they, the Evangelist who was a Jew, speaks here of the *Messias*, in the usual Style and Language of the Jews; who were wont to say, they say it in almost all their Ancient Books, that the *Messias* should make a *New World*, he should make all Things new; he should abolish Paganism and Idolatry from among the Nations, and thereby (as the Prophets also speak) create a *New Heaven and New Earth*. 'Tis well, saith his Grace; and why may not another Man as well come and interpret the first Chapter of *Genesis*, after the same manner? I answer; if that Chapter impured the Creation there spoken of, to *Moses*; if it said, In the Beginning *Moses* created the Heavens and the Earth, he said, let there be Light, and there was Light: It would be not only, *not absurd*, but absolutely necessary, to interpret the Chapter allegorically and figuratively. It would be necessary to say, that the Heavens and Earth are the Jewish *Polity and Religion*; and that the *Light* is that Law of God given by the Ministry of *Moses*, by which the former Ignorance or *Darkness* was dispelled: And he that should not thus interpret; but suppose that a *Man* made the Heavens and Earth, in the literal Sense; should either make the Author of the Book a *Blasphemer*, or himself a *Fool*. We abide therefore by his Grace's Instance; we say it, we affirm it: that if the first Chapter of *Genesis* impu-



and the Creation to *Mosses*, it ought to be interpreted, not of the Creation of the *Visible* Heavens and Earth, or of *Material* Light; but of *Intellectual* Light, even the Law of God given by *Mosses*; and of the Spiritual Heavens and Earth, namely the Church, and the Religion and Discipline thereof.

The first Sermon of his *Grace*, begins with an Account of the Occasion of *St. John's* writing his Gospel; and more particularly, this first Chapter of it. He saith, *Ebion* and *Christus* began to deny the Divinity of our Saviour, asserting him to have been a meer Man, who had no Existence before he was born of Blessed *Mary*; and that the *Gnostics* corrupted the Simplicity of the Christian Faith, by *Cabbalistical* and *Platonic* Notions; reckoning up I know not how many *Eras*, among which they counted the *Word*, the *Life*, the *Falsity*, the *Only-begotten*, which they fancied to be Divine Emanations and Powers. They also distinguished between *Jesus*, and *Christ*; *Jesus* being (according to them) the *Man* that was born of *Mary*; and *Christ* (or the *Messias*) the Divine Power or Spirit that rested on him. He saith further; that in opposition to this *Case*, *St. John* in the beginning of his Gospel, calls our Blessed Saviour the *Word*; it being a Term given to the *Messias* by the Jews, even by all the Sects of them. Then *St. John* shows, that this *Word* was in the beginning, that is, from all Eternity; against *Ebion* and *Christus*; and afterwards, that the *Word*, the *Life*, the *Falsity*, the *Only-begotten*, are not so many several Divine Emanations, but do all belong to the Lord *Christ*; against *Christus* and the *Gnostics*. His *Grace* blames *Socius*, that he should undertake to interpret this Context; by their strength and subtilty of *Reason* and *Wit*; without considering, or so much as understanding the *Historical* Occasion; which is the only thing that can give a true Light, to any Ancient Book or Text.

The *Historical* Occasion. *Socius* finding it to be the first of all God's Declarations, and Commandments to Men; *I am the Lord thy*

*God*, thou shalt have no other God but me: And observing moreover, that to establish the Unity of God, is the chief Design of both the Testaments: He thought hereupon, that it ought to be the very first Rule of interpreting Scripture; so to interpret, as to preserve inviolably the Faith of the Unity of God. Therefore finding *St. John* saying, *In the beginning was the WORD*; He concluded, we must not interpret *is the beginning*, to be *without beginning*; not only because these two are directly contrary, but because only *God* and the *Divine Attributes* are without beginning. So he understood *is the beginning*, to be *in the beginning of the Gospel-State*: which he saw would perfectly agree to the Lord *Christ*; and would imply nothing that was impossible or absurd, or contradictory to the Unity of God.

The *WORD* was a *God*; there is, saith *Socius*, but One God: Therefore when the *WORD* is here called a God, it must be meant in a Sense of *Office*, or of *Mission*, or of *Representation*, (not of Nature;) as *Mosses*, and others, are (consecratedly) called Gods in Scripture. And whereas 'tis here said, that *all Things were made by the Word*, and that *the World was made by him*; because 'tis agreed, that as there is but One God, so also that there is but One Creator of the *Matural* World: therefore he supposed, that the *all Things*, and the *World* here meant, must be the *Spiritual* World, and the *New Creation*; which both by the Prophets, and by this Evangelist (in the *Revelation*) is called the *New Heaven*, and the *New Earth*; of which State, Creation, or Heavens and Earth, *Jesus Christ* is the unquestionable Author and Maker.

*Socius* saw plainly, that *St. John* having at first called the *WORD* (or the Lord *Christ*) a *God*; that he might equal him to *Mosses*, ('Author of the Jewish State') who is so called in Scripture: therefore to carry on the Metaphor, he speaks of him throughout, in the Terms of *Creation*. He trusted so far to his Reader's Judgment and good Sense, that it being a confess'd Truth, that

that there is but One true God, and but One Creator of the Visible World, he would therefore be aware, that the Creation and World here imputed to the Lord Christ, was the Spiritual Heavens and Earth; of which the Prophets speak, and which the *Messias* was to make. He observed, that the Scriptures abound with such Metaphors and Figures, even when they speak of God. For so, for Instance; because 'tis an undoubted Truth, that God is Omnipresent and Infinite, and consequently hath no Figure or Shape: Therefore the Scriptures, trusting to the Judgment of the most common Readers, doubt not to speak of the Eyes, Arm, Hand, Back-parts, Bowels of God; they question not that the most ordinary Capacity will understand, that all such Expressions are meant *Figuratively*, namely to denote the Universal Sight, the Power, the Mercies (and such-like) of God.

Ofie, says his Grace; How strangely has this Man mistook, for want of the Light of Ancient History? Why, he interprets *Scripture*, by *Scripture*; and by *Reason*, and *Wit*: not by the *Fathers*, and the old *Historians* of the Church's Party. He should have look'd first, into *Epiphanius* and *Irenæus*; where he might have seen very wonderful Tales about the Word, the Life, the Fulness, the Only-begotten: which the *Gnostics* took to be so many Divine Emanations, Powers, or Beings. Then he should have taken up this Gospel of St. *John*: and tho' *John* says nothing of *Ebion*, *Cerintus*, or the *Gnostics*; yet because *John* hath, by chance, used the words *Life*, *Fulness*, *Only-begotten*; *Socius* should have imagined, that this was intended for the Confutation of those *Gnostics*, and of *Cerintus* and *Ebion*.

I marvel much, how his Grace should know, that *Socius* had not read (those precious Authors) *Epiphanius* and *Irenæus*, and the Tale of the *Gnostics* and their *Eons*? I am of Opinion, that *Socius* had seen these Fooleries, in those Authors, and yet thought he had very good reason to believe, that St. *John* had quite another Aim, than

to confute the *Gnostics*. Without doubt *Socius* had read in the Ecclesiastical History of *Eusebius*, what Account the Antients give of the Occasion, of Saint *John's* writing his Gospel; an Account very different from this of his Grace. The Antients said, "that the other Evangelists having committed to writing only the Gests of our Saviour, during one Year's space: therefore the Apostle *John*, being thereto requested, declared in a Gospel according to him, the Time that was passed over by the other Evangelists; and what was done, by our Saviour, therein. *Euseb. l. 3. c. 24.* This is what the Antients said: as for the Historical Occasion assigned by his Grace, we may well think, it was below the Gravity of this Apostle, to confute the (wild) *Gnostics* and their (Chimerical) *Eons*, to have any respect, or take any notice of such (sickly) Dreams. I am of Opinion, that there is no Historian, (I am sure, there is no Antient Historian) who assigns that Historical Occasion of St. *John's* writing; even the *Gnostics* and their *Eons*, mentioned by his Grace. In short, he hath not very justly blamed *Socius*, for not knowing an Historical Occasion, which is mentioned by no Historian.

Whereas his Grace thinks fit, to object to us *Ebion* and *Cerintus*: who denied, he saith, the Divinity of our Saviour; saying, he had no Existence, before he was born of *Mary*. I confess, I have met with these two Names in the Church-History.

Concerning *Ebion*, it is doubted by the Critics; whether ever there was any such Man? *Origen* (*cont. Cel. l. 2. and Philocal. c. 1.*) intimates, that the *Ebionites* were so called from their Poverty; the word *Ebionites* signifying Poor Men. Nor is it to be wondred; that this Name was given by some, to the first Christians: because in very deed, the Church at first consisted (for the most part, if not altogether) of the meaner and poorer Sort; 1 Cor. 1. 26. *Ye know your Calling, Brethren; how not many Mighty, nor many Noble, are called.* Reformation,

injunction, almost always, begins, at the poorer sort of People: these having nothing to lose, nor having any Interests that depend on the Public, their Subsistence coming from their own Hands and Industry; they have none of those Hopes or Awe's that deter others, from seeing or owning the Truth.

As for *Cerinthus*, he is made to be a great Unitarian, our very Author and Founder; by most of our Modern Opposers: who also will have it, that St. John wrote this Gospel purposely against *Etion*, (who never was) and against this *Cerinthus*. But very many of the Antients, who lived nearest to the Apostolic Times, and some of them in those very Times, were so little of the Opinion; that St. John wrote his Gospel, against *Cerinthus*: that they believed, that *Cerinthus* was the true Author of the Gospel, imputed to St. John. Thus much is certain, and confess'd by 'em All; that the Ancient Unitarians (from the Apostolic Times, to the Nicene Council, or thereabouts) did reject the Gospel, Epistles, and Revelation, now reckoned to St. John; and said they were written by the Heretic *Cerinthus*, to confirm this Heretic's Gabbalistic and Platonic Notions about the *Logos* or Word, and his Jewish Dreams about the Millenary Kingdom (or Thousand Years Reign) of the *Messias* upon Earth.

The truth is, this is a very obscure, and puzzling Part of History. For if *Cerinthus* held the Unity of God, and denied the Divinity and the Pre-existence of our Saviour; as his *Grace* and the Moderns suppose; neither, it should seem, would the Unitarians have reckoned him a Heretic; nor have rejected the Books which they supposed to be his, namely, the Gospel, Epistles, and Revelation now attributed to St. John. I confess; tho' I affirm nothing in the matter, I should be glad to see a good Answer; to the Exceptions against the Books which we receive as St. John's, that were made by the Ancient Unitarians:

who were Contemporaries to the First Fathers of the Church; and were older than any of those Fathers whose Works are now extant. See here a short Account, what were the Allegations of the Unitarians; out of *Eusebius*, but especially out of St. Epiphanius, who hath written very largely of this Matter, *Hier. Alog. c. 4.* and 22, and 33.

1. They said it was the Current Opinion, and General Tradition, that *Cerinthus*, and not St. John, was Author as well of the Gospel and Epistles, as of the Revelation, that go under St. John's Name: for as to the Revelation, 'twas scarce doubted by any to be the Work of *Cerinthus*; and as such, was wrote against by divers Learned Men of the Catholic Perswasion, as 'tis now called.

2. That this Gospel is wholly made use of, by the *Cerinthians* and *Valentinians*, the Two chief Sects of the Gnostics. And in very deed St. Irenæus doth also say, that the Gnostics, the Followers of *Valentinus*, did most readily use the Gospel of St. John. His words are these, *En quod est secundum Johannem Plenissime Utentes; ad ostensionem Conjugationum suarum: i. e.* They very greedily use the Gospel of St. John, as a Proof of their Eons, *Lib. 3. c. 11.* How is it possible to reconcile what his *Grace* says, with these two Observations of St. Epiphanius, and St. Irenæus, Authors to whom his *Grace* himself refers us; namely, that the Gnostics offer'd this very Gospel, as the Ground and Proof of their Platonic Notions about the Word, the Life, the Fulness, and other Eons; and that the Unitarians rejected *Cerinthus*, as an Heretic, and for his sake the Gospel now called St. John's?

3. They objected, that the other Three Evangelists suppose all along, that our Saviour preached but one Year; and therefore they reckon but one Passover; but (the pretended) St. John counts Three Years, and Three Passovers. Which seems to be an unaccountable Contradiction, and yet is granted on all Hands; some finding a Fourth Year and Passover.

4. The other Evangelists agree, that immediately after his Baptism, our Lord was led into the Wilderness, to be tempted 40 Days. But *Cerinthus*, who knew not the Series or Order of our Saviour's Life and Miracles, says in the Gospel which he has (say they) forged for St. *John*; that the next Day after his Baptism, our Saviour spake with *Andrew* and *Peter*; and the Day after went into *Galilee*; and on the third Day was at a Wedding in *Cana*; and after this he departed with his Mother and Brethren to *Capernaum*, where he abode some time.

5. He has feigned an Epistle, as from St. *John*, to the Bishop and Church of *Thyatira*; in which he greatly commendeth the Bishop and Church for Faith, Patience, and Good Works; blaming them nevertheless, for suffering *Jezebel* to vend her self for a Prophetess. *Revel.* 2. 19, 20. But 'tis certain, and notorious among all the Bishops and Churches of *Asia*, said the Unitarians; that there was no Bishop, no nor Church at *Thyatira*, till a long time after St. *John*'s Death: the Seeds of a Church, which St. *Paul* had begun to sow there, being rooted up by the Persecution; that was shortly after raised against them. 'Tis a very ridiculous Answer, that is made to this Exception by *Epiphanius*; who being sensible (because himself was originally of *Asia*) of the Truth of this Objection, is forced to be content with this vain Elusion: that St. *John* in that Epistle to *Thyatira* writes prophetically; that is, he only foretels the future Vertues and Faults of the Bishop and Church, which should in time to come be gathered and settled at *Thyatira*. But to return, to his Grace's Sermons.

Whereas in his first Sermon he alledges the words, of the Epistle to the Hebrews; *In these last days God hath spoken to us by his Son, by whom also he made the Worlds*, Heb. 1. 2. I deny not, that the Greek word *αἰῶνες* doth sometimes (in H. Scripture) signify *World* or *Worlds*; but neither will his Grace deny,

that it's more usual, and also its proper Signification, is *Ages*: and accordingly, so it is translated (in the Vulgar Latin) by St. *Jerom*; who saith here, *Per quem fecit & secula*. Therefore divers, of the most Learned Critics of the Trinitarians, understand this Text of the Gospel-Ages; of which, the Lord Christ is (under God) the undoubted Author. But let us say, that *αἰῶνες* here is *World*: yet *Gratius* (in l.) gives very good Reasons, why we ought to render the Text, thus; for whom he made the *Worlds*. i. e. God made the *World*, for the *Messias*; or with Intention to subject it to him, in the Fullness of Time. Would a Man build the Belief of more Gods than one, contrary to the whole Current, and most express Words of the rest of Scripture, on a Text so uncertain, as this is?

He urgeth also that Text to the Colossians; where 'tis said of our Saviour, *By him were all Things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth*, Col. 1. 16. He observes moreover, that in the foregoing Verse, the Lord Christ is called the *First-born* of every Creature: and he seeks to prove, I think he has proved it; that *First-born* here, is as much as to say the *Heir*, or Lord of every Creature.

I will omit, what the greater Number of the Critics and more Learned Interpreters, of his Grace's own Party, and among them *Athanasius* himself, translate and interpret that Text; not of the Real Creating, or Original Making; but of the Modelling of all Things: so as to make this Sense. By the Lord Christ, who is of God made *Heir* and Lord of all things, have all these things (both in Heaven and Earth) been Modelled; i. e. changed to a New, and Better Estate. He hath modelled all things on the Earth, by abolishing Paganism and Idolatry; and substituting in their room the Knowledge, and the Worship of the true God: in Heaven he hath made a very great Change; the Angels, and other heavenly Powers, being put under his Directions, and by him employed in the Defence and Succour of the Faithful: *Heb.* 1. 14. *Rev.* 1. 1. This is the

G 2      Sense

Sense of very many of the more Learned of our Opposers, both Antients and Moderns, concerning this Text: but, as I said, I will not insist on this Concession; there is another Interpretation of this Text, which (it may be) is the truer. It is the Account given of it, by St. John Chrysostom, in the *Opus Imperfectum* on St. Matthew's Gospel; he reads thus. *The First-born, or the Heir or Lord* (to which Sense, his Grace also agreeeth) *of all Creatures; For, for him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth.* So the Sense is, all things were originally created by God, for the Lord Christ; namely, to subject them (in the Fulness of Time) to Him and his Law. In like manner, we ought to read at the 16th Verse of this First to the Colossians; not with our English Translation, All Things were created by him and for him: but, all Things were created for him and to him. For the Greek words are *δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν*; in which words, *εἰς αὐτόν* being probably designed as exegetical (or explanatory) of *δι' αὐτοῦ*: therefore the Sense of necessity is, for him and to him; i. e. for his Use, and to his Service. And these Readings clear to us the 17th Verse; which in the English Translation runs thus: *He is before all things, and by him all things consist*: but *αὐτὸς ὁ πρῶτος*, ought to have been rendered *above all things*; and *πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ὄντα* is, *they all consist and are united in him*, namely as in their Head or Governour. So the Meaning of the whole Context, will be this; "For him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities; they were All (I say) created for him and to him: and now, in the Fulness of time, he is actually set above them; and in him as in their Head they are all united and consist. There can be nothing more natural, than this Translation; there is no need of devising a second God, and another Creator, to make out St. Paul's Sense in this place.

Towards the Conclusion of his first Ser-

mon, his Grace says, at p. 44. that the Socinian Interpretation of the first Verses of St. John's Gospel, contradicts that Interpretation of those Verses, which hath been received; not only by all the Fathers, but even by the general Consent of all Christians, for Fifteen hundred Years together. I know his Meaning; it contradicts the Arians, as well as the Trinitarians Interpretation of this Context; which two Parties made the whole Body of Christendom.

Well; suppose this: why may we not own, that Time and long Consideration do improve all sorts of Science, and every part of Learning; whether Divine, or Humane? I do not think it, to be any Diminution of Socinus; that it may be said of him, and of this Context,

*Eruit ē tētris Longæ Caliginis Umbrā,*

*He hath rescued it, from that Darkness and Obscurity, in which it long lay.*

Nor do I understand, that a Period of 15 Ages (or 1500 Years) is any such great Credit, were it true, to his Grace's Cause: for how much younger is Popery? And if of seventeen Ages of Christianity, we have (as we undoubtedly have) the two first; much Good may do his Grace, with the other fifteen. He must not deny us the two, nay the three first; generally speaking. We will wrest it, from all the World; that the Apostolic Creed, which was the only Creed of the Three first Ages, is wholly Unitarian, and perfectly contradicts that Interpretation of the beginning of St. John's Gospel, which his Grace seeks to advance.

But why doth his Grace say; that not only all the Fathers, but all Christians have, for these Fifteen Ages, agreed in his Interpretation of this Context? Have there been no Christians in the World, for 1500 Years; but only the Arians, and Trinitarians? Or was Socinus the first, for that (it may be) was his Grace's Meaning; I say, was Socinus the first Man, who departed from the Arian and Trini-



*Trinitarian* Sense of this Context? It is true, the Ancient *Unitarians* did generally reject the Gospel, and other Pieces, now attributed to St. John; yet because they saw, it began to grow into credit among the other Denominations of Christians, many of which had been seduced by the Platonic Philosophers that came over to Christianity: therefore they were careful to shew them, that it was capable of a very allowable Sense; and that it doth not appear, that either St. John or *Cerinthus* intended to advance a Second God. Of these Unitarians, *Paulus* (Patriarch of Antioch) and *Photinus* (Metropolitan of Illyricum) did not expressly deny the Authority of the Gospel called St. John's; but interpreted it. In the Beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God; the latter, said they, was intended to explain the former: for the Meaning is, the Word was from the Beginning with God, in the Intention, Mind, or Decree of God. This Sense of Christ's being in the Beginning (or from the Beginning) with God; they confirmed by the express Words of St. Peter concerning him: 1 Pet. 1. 19. *Who verily was fore-ordained, before the Foundation of the World; but was manifested in these last Times.* But whereas the WORD is here also called a God; they said: that Christ being the Son of God, generated not by Man but by the Divine Power, he ought not to be reckoned among *mere Creatures*; as his Generation was *Divine*, so also ought his Name to be; yet always remembering, that there is but *One true God*. They denied, that the Author ought to be understood as saying, in the following Verses; that all Things were made by him, and the World was made by him: that was not his Intention, but all Things were made for him, the World was made for him; which the Jews always affirmed of the *Messias*. It is certain, that the Unitarians, the Followers of *Paulus* and *Photinus*, abounded every where; and even possessed some whole Provinces: therefore there was no cause for his Grace to say; that for 1500 Years, all Christians interpreted

this Context of St. John, either as the *Arians* or *Trinitarians* do; the Ancient Unitarians knew how to interpret it, without introducing more Gods or more Creators. At p. 67. his Grace saith; that if the Interpretation of *Socius* be true, here are two Things very wonderful, and almost incredible. 1. That the Fathers who lived so very near to St. John's time, and therefore were most likely to know his Meaning; as *Ignatius*, *Iustin*, *Artemagoras*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, should so widely mistake it. 2. That the whole Christian World, for so many Ages together, should fall, or should be led into so gross an Error; as this must be confessed to be, if Christ had really no Existence before he was conceived in the Womb of Blessed Mary. He adds, that *Amelius* (a Platonic Philosopher) who was a more indifferent Judge than either the Orthodox or the Arians, did understand this Passage of St. John; without any Thought, that John spoke (not of the Old) but of the New Creation, or the Reformation of the World by the Preaching of the Gospel: and that no indifferent Reader would so understand it, unless he were first biased by some very strong Prejudice.

To the first; concerning the Fathers, who lived (as his Grace says) nearest to St. John's time: we have noted before, that divers of the Fathers who were nearest to the Age of St. John, did not believe this Gospel to be written by St. John; but by *Cerinthus*. And if some of them believed this to be St. John's Gospel; yet it certainly appears, that both then, and for a long time after, the Christian Church generally understood this Context, either as the Ancient, or as the Modern Unitarians do. For in the Creed which they called the Apostolic Creed, because it contains the true Apostolic Doctrine and Tradition; and which was their only Creed: the Lord Christ is (unconfrontably) spoken of as having no Existence, before he was generated in the Womb of Blessed Mary, by the Spirit of God.

But whereas his Grace is pleased, particularly to name *Ignatius*, *Iustin*, *Origen*, and some.

some others: we are ready to dispute it, in the presence of the Learned World; that the Fathers mentioned by his Grace, were less of the Mind of the *present* Trinitarians, than of ours. They held the Doctrine that was afterwards called *Arianism*; they believed the *Antemundane* Existence, of our Saviour: but neither that he was *Co-eternal*, or *Co-equal* with the Father; nor that he, in Conjunction with the Father and Spirit, maketh up the One true God. They were constant to this; that the *Father* is the only *True*, and most *High God*. I know, what our Opposers will here object; Dr. *Bull's* Book on this Argument. But we have an Answer ready, to the (Artificial) Elusions of that Treatise: an Answer so clear, so sincere, and written with that Temper and Modesty; that we may well hope, it will have a *present* Effect on all Learned, and Unprejudiced Persons, whenever 'tis published.

To the other; that if the Socinian Interpretation be true, the *Christian World* has been in a *most gross* Error, these many Ages. We think, that 'tis no wonder at all; that the *Christian World* (as his Grace complements his Party) should have been, a very long time, in a gross Error. The Worship of *Relicks*, the Invocation of dead Men, the Belief of the *Real Presence* in the Eucharist, the Efficacy of Baptism to regenerate, the thousand Years Reign, and divers more, are all of them older; and some of them as general, as the Doctrine of a *Trinity*, of *Co-eternal* and *Co-equal* Divine Persons.

But furthermore, who is ignorant; I am sure, his Grace is not: by what *Arts* and *Torments*, the *Christian World* (as his Grace affects to speak in this matter) hath been *constrained*, to profess and hold this monstrous Doctrine? If, as his Grace says, this Context of St. *John* were so clear; for the Divinity of our Saviour, as 'tis now held: what needed all that great Scir that has been made, by *Church-Censures*, and *Sanguinary Laws*; to secure the Belief of it? Who ever heard of Laws and Penalties, to make People believe,

that the Sun shines? which is not, they say, more clear, than their Doctrine in H. Scripture. We see then, that whatever our Opposers pretend; of the great Clearness of St. *John*, on their Side: they really believe nothing less. If they truly believed, as they say; they would never think it necessary, to use the Precaution of such mighty *Arms*, and *Draconic Sanctions*, to maintain a Faith so obvious (as they pretend) to every unprejudiced, and every honest Man. As to Friend *Amelius*; I think it sufficient, to say. That the Credit of the Trinitarian Cause runs very low: when an *Uncertain Tale*, of an *Obscure Platonist*, of no Reputation either for Learning or Wit, is made to be a good Part of the Proof, that can be alledged for these Doctrines.

I shall add no more, on his Grace's Observations upon this first Chapter of St. *John's* Gospel. But it may be, the Author of the *Trinity* placed in *its due Light*, will expect to be heard; concerning a *Criticisim*, that he hath advanced. The Socinians are wont to say; that the 14th Verse of this Chapter, rendred in our English Bibles, the WORD *was made* Flesh, might have been translated, the WORD *was* Flesh, or Man: because (the Greek) *ἐγένετο* in this very Chapter, is rendred (at Verse 6.) by *was*, not by *was made*; even by our Opposers themselves. To this, he answers; that the true *Critical Difference*, between *ἦν* and *ἐγένετο*, is this: that *ἦν* signifies a thing to be *simply* such, as is there expressed; but *ἐγένετο* imports a Change of it, from some former State. Well, we grant, that *ordinarily* it is so; but he himself dares not pretend, that always it is so. When the Nature of the Subject spoken of, will not admit of it; and when it appears, that the Writer is full of Solecisms and Improprieties: an Interpreter is not to be blamed, if he rather admits a *less common Form of Speaking*; than of an *Absurd and Impossible Doctrine*. But neither do we care at all, whether our Opposers read here, the WORD *was made* Man, which is his Grace's Reading; or as *we* do, the WORD

was a Man; for one of these implies no more than the other. There is no difference between these two Propositions, the WORD *was made* a Man, and the WORD *was* a Man: for the former is not said, to denote that the WORD was something else before it was made a Man; but only, that when God made the WORD, he made him a Man, not an Angel, or other Being superior to Men. And this the Holy Scriptures are careful elsewhere also to tell us; particularly at *Heb. 2. 9. He was made lower than the Angels.* Of which Text this Author, if he pleases, (or if he can) may give us such an Account, as will consist with the Divinity of our Saviour: but the clearness of the Context there, will set aside all Critical Elusions.

But I return to his *Grace*.

After having improved his Text, to the uttermost; his Grace proceeds to alledge two sorts of Texts, to prove (further) the Divinity of our Saviour. The first sort is of those, which speak of our Saviour as *pre-existing*, before he appeared in the World. The second ascribe to him, the Creation of the World it self. On these last, I have made a large Criticism, in the Answer to Mr. Milbourn; of the other, it will be convenient to say something here.

1. He observeth, that our Saviour saith of himself; that *He ascended into Heaven, and came down from Heaven*: That, *He shall ascend up, where he was before*: That, *He came from God, and goes to God*: That, *He came from the Father, and goes to the Father*. St. John adds concerning him, that, *He was with the Father, and then was manifested to us.* All this is out of the Gospel and Epistles of St. John; John 3. 13. and 6. 62. and 13. 3. and 16. 27. 1 John 1. 1, 2.

Now taking all these Texts, in their most literal Sense; what do they amount to? do they affirm more than this, that the Lord Christ is a Messenger, really come forth from God, to Men? As much is true, of every Prophet; and the very same Language is used concerning St. John Baptist,

John 1. 6. *There was a Man sent from God, whose Name was John.* How little these Texts are to his Grace's Purpose, would have been obvious to every Reader: if, as he is so careful to collect all the Texts, that speak of our Saviour's coming forth from, or (what is the same) being sent by God; he had also set down some few of the (many) Texts which tell us, in what manner those former Texts (by him cited) are to be understood. For Instance, when his Hand was in, with the Texts that speak of our Saviour's coming from God, from the Father, from Heaven: Why did he not add also these Texts, which so plainly expound to us, what is meant thereby? John 17. 28. *I am not come of my self.* John 5. 43. *I am come, in my Father's Name.* John 8. 42. *I proceeded forth, and came from God; I came not of my self, he sent me.* John 12. 49. *The Father which sent me, he gave me Commandment what I should say.* John 14. 31. *As the Father gave me Commandment, so do I.* John 7. 6. *My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.* Lay these Texts, to the Texts cited by his Grace; and in the Judgment of any unprejudiced Man, they give us this Account of our Saviour. That he is a Messenger, who is come forth from, or is sent by God; to deliver to Men a certain Doctrine, which is not the Messenger's, no not in the least part of it; but is the same, in every Title of it, which God commanded him to deliver to us. I ask now; Is this a sort of Language, proper to be used concerning a Person, who is himself the most High God? Had our Saviour pretended himself to be God, the one true God; would he have said, that he is come from God, is sent by God: to deliver a Doctrine and Message, in God's Name; a Doctrine commanded to him, by God the Author of it?

But we may consider too, what his Grace propounded to prove; even that the Lord Christ was *pre-existent*, or did exist before he was born of Blessed Mary: and how doth he prove it? Why, by Texts that ex-  
press

pressly say, that the Lord Christ *ascended into Heaven* before he began his Ministry, and then *came down from Heaven*, to declare the Commandments and Will of God to Men. That is, he propounds to prove the *Trinitarian* Doctrine, but really proves the Doctrine of the *Unitarians*.

I cannot but wonder, that after he had quoted these words of our Saviour; *John 3. 13. No Man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that is come down from Heaven, even the Son of Man*: I say, I cannot but wonder, that having quoted this Text, and understanding it in the *literal* Sense, he should find fault with us, for affirming, that our Saviour (before he entered on his Ministry) *ascended into Heaven*, as *Moses* did into the Mount, to be instructed in all things belonging to the Gospel-Doctrine and Polity, which he was to establish and administer. He cites some of the principal Texts; which being taken in a *literal* Sense, as he takes them, expressly affirm our Doctrine: and yet he calls it, an *arbitrary and precarious Supposition*. He demands, When did this *Ascension of our Saviour into Heaven* happen; in what part of his Life? As if it were not enough, that the thing is very often, and expressly said, in Texts quoted by himself. But his Grace shall never put that Question to me, which I will not satisfy, if I can, and reasonably may. In what Part of our Saviour's Life, says he, was the Lord Christ in Heaven? St. *John* hath resolved this Question, in the first Words of his Gospel: *In the beginning the WORD was with God: &c.* In the beginning of his Ministry, just before he entered thereon; the Lord Christ *was with God*, by *ascending* (as himself expressly and often saith) *into Heaven*.

The Author of the *Trinity* placed in its due Light, is ambitious to be *Second* to his Grace, upon one of the Texts by him cited. *John 3. 13. No Man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that is come down from Heaven, even the Son of Man; who was in Heaven.* So the last words are translated by the great Critics, *Beza, Erasmus, and Camerarius*. But this

Author likes it not; he saith, *ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, must be rendered, as 'tis in our English Bibles, who *is* in Heaven, which denotes our Saviour's *Omnipresence*, and consequently his *Divinity*: not, who *was* in Heaven. 'Tis contrary, he saith, to *all Grammar, and Practice*, to interpret *ὢν* by *was*: *ὢν* being of the Present Tense, not of the Past. To *all Grammar, and Practice*: I wonder, what peculiar Grammars, this Gentleman uses; and some Others will wonder, that *Camerarius, Erasmus, and Beza*, should be ignorant of *Grammar, and Practice*. But to be short, let him vouchsafe but to make use of any of the common Grammars, and he will see; that *ὢν* is of the Imperfect, as well as of the Present Tense, and therefore must be translated by *was*, or *is*, as the Circumstances (of the Syntax, or of the Person spoken-of) shall require. But 'tis contrary, he saith, to *Practice*, to render *ὢν* by *was*. Let him look into *John 9. 5.* where he will find these words, *ὃν οὐδὲν, ὅτι τυφλὸς ὦν, ἀπὸν βλεῖναι*; which is thus translated (nor can it possibly be otherwise translated) in our English Bibles: *This I know, that whereas I WAS blind, now I see.* It is so little true, what this Decider of *Critical Differences*, says; that 'tis contrary to *Practice*, to render *ὢν* by *was*: that so it is rendered, above thirty times, in only the Historical Books of the New Testament.

2. His Grace alledges, for the pre-existence of our Saviour, *John 17. 5. O Father, glorify me with thy own self, with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was.* We answer, with St. *Austin, and Grotius*; the meaning is: Let me now *actually* receive that Glory with thy self, which I had with thee in thy Decree and Purpose, before the World was. I have sufficiently confirmed this Interpretation, in the (second Edition of the) *Brief History of the Unitarians*, p. 31, 32.

3. But our Saviour saith of himself, to the Jews; *Before Abraham was, I am*; or as the Syriac and Nonnus read, *I was.* *John 8. 58.* We answer as before, with the illustrious

lustrious *Gratius*; that a Man, the Son and Descendant of *Abraham*, could no other ways be before *Abraham*, but only *Constitutione Divisa*; is the Appointment, Purpose, and Decree of God; and we find, that he was promised also immediately upon the Fall. Therefore he might most truly, and pertinently say; thus he was (meaning, in the Purpose, Decree, and Counsel of God) before *Abraham*, or any other particular Person who was to live after the Fall. His Grace will not hear of this. We cannot help it; but we know the Reason to be: because he taketh it as a Ground of his Interpretation of this Text, that our Saviour was (not only in God's Decree and Appointment, but) in Actual Existence, before his Predecessor *Abraham*; but that is the Point which his Grace had to prove, not to suppose as a Ground of Interpretation.

Here again I must mind his Grace; that none of his Proofs, in their utmost stretch, run higher than *Arianism*. For supposing this Text said, that the Lord Christ was in actual Existence, and not only in Purpose and Promise, before *Abraham*: This may help to confirm the Arian Doctrine, of an Antecedent Existence of our Saviour; but 'tis wholly impertinent, towards proving his Pre-*eternal* Existence, which is the thing his Grace undertakes. But if we can, let us make both *Arians* and *Trinitarians* sensible, what is the meaning of these words, *Before Abraham was I am*; from the Circumstances and Context.

Our Lord had said at *Vers. 36*. *Abraham saw my Day, and was glad*. That is, *Abraham* foresaw this Day of my Appearance in the World; in the Prophecies and Promises concerning me, made partly to *Adam*, partly to *Abraham* himself: and he greatly rejoiced at it. Then he adds; without regarding the malicious and senseless Construction, that the Jews made of those words: I say, he adds at *V. 38*. *Before Abraham was, I am*. As who should say; let none stumble as what I said, that *Abraham* saw my Day of Appearance in the World: for long before

*Abraham* was, I was; not only in the Decree, but in the Express Promises of God. I was promised to *Adam*, before *Abraham* was; nay, I was promised to *Abraham* himself: that 'tis no marvel I should say, he saw my Day, as coming, tho' not as present.

*Before Abraham was, I was, or I am*; that is, say We: I was long before *Abraham's* Time or Age, in the Decrees and Promises of God. Our Opposers answer; it looks too much like an Evasion and Elusion, to impute to our Saviour such a delusory Meaning. We reply, 1. The words cannot be true, in any other Sense, being spoken of one, who was a Son and Descendant of *Abraham*.

2. There was a very just Occasion for our Saviour, so to speak; and immediately before, by confession of all Parties, he spoke in the same Key and manner. For he said, *Abraham* saw my Day, and was glad; meaning, he saw it as the Decree and Promise of God: that were made both to *Adam*, and to *Abraham* himself. Correspondently hereto, he adds at *Vers. 38*. *I was, before Abraham*; meaning again, I was in God's Decree and Promise, before the Times of *Abraham*. In short, we say; as at *Vers. 36*. *Abraham* saw Christ's Day, in the Prophecies and Promises of God: So at *Vers. 38*. Christ was in the Day of *Abraham*, and before; in the Promises and express Prophecies, given forth by God, concerning him.

What man, that well considers, how often the Unity of God is inculcated in Holy Scripture, and by our Saviour himself; I say, what (unprejudiced) Man would not thus interpret, being invited thereto by so manifest a Direction in the Context itself? Who would look for a second God, or another Creator, in an *Incidental* Expression; contrary to the whole Tenour of Scripture: when the Intention of that very Expression, seems plainly enough determined by the Context, to denote only as Existence in the Promises and Decrees of God? You will excuse it, Sir, if I have been longer upon this Text, than well comports with the

H

brevity



Brevity of my Design in this present Work: it being one of the principal Texts, on which our Opposers build their (unhappy) Mistake.

4. In the next place, his Grace citeth 1 John 1. 1, 2. *That, which was from the beginning; which we have seen, — and our Hands have handled, of the Word of Life. For the Life was manifested: for we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that Eternal Life, which was with the Father, and was manifested to us.*

The Subject of these Verses, is the *Word of Life*, which is here also called *Eternal Life*. *Origen* and *Vossius*, two the ablest Interpreters that the Church has yet had, understand by the *Word of Life*, the Gospel; and by *Eternal Life*, that *Immortality* which is therein promised, and was not (definitively) known, till it was brought to Light by the Gospel. These are here said, to have been from the beginning with the Father; and then (in the Fulness of Time) manifested to the World: that is, they were always with God, they were always purposed and intended by him; but were not (expressly and distinctly) manifested, at least not to the Gentiles, till in the Gospel they were revealed to all. St. John saith, we have seen, and handled, and we show to you, that *Word of Life*, and *Eternal Life*; to signify, that their knowledge of it, was most assured and absolute: for the *Hebrews* are wont to declare the Certainty and Clearness of Things, by Terms and Expressions borrowed from the Senses.

I know not, why his Grace overlook'd this Interpretation, of two the most Learned and Judicious Critics of this, or any other Age. But he hath thought it enough, to cite this Context; and to hint, that by the *Word of Life*, and *Eternal Life*, he understands (not the Doctrine of the Gospel, and the *Immortality* there taught, but) the Person of our Saviour: and we think it enough, to oppose our Interpretation, so well expanded; to his, for which he has alleged no Proof.

5. The last of his Grace's Texts, to prove the *Pre-existence*, and the *Divinity* of our Saviour, is; Rev. 1. 8. *I am Alpha, and Omega, the Beginning and the End; saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.*

I answer; when his Grace proves that these words are spoken, not of God, but of Christ; I will thank him, and give him the Cause. In the mean time, that they are not spoken of our Lord Christ, seems to me as clear as Meridian Light, from what is said at Vers. 4. *Grace be to you, and Peace from him which is, and which was, and is to come; and from Jesus Christ.* We see plainly here; that Jesus Christ is distinguished, as a different Person, from that Almighty who is, and who was, and is to come: therefore he cannot be intended, in the Description at Vers. 8.

After these thorny and ungrateful Contentions, about the meaning of particular Expressions and Texts; we come to something more easy and diverting.

Towards the Conclusion of his Second Sermon, his Grace is pleased to intimate; that after all the stir we make, about the Unity or Oneness of God; we are our selves *Polytheists*, and *Idolaters*. And that we can say nothing in excuse, of either; but what will (in great measure) excuse the Papists, and even the Pagans.

I will own; I did not expect such a Thunder-clap, from his Grace. What; are we *Idolaters*, and *Polytheists*: and have we no way to apologize for our selves; but so, as at the same time to defend the Papists, and the very Heathens? Who, where are they; that use to accuse the Arch-bishop, as Syncretising with the Socinians? It appears, they are as much out; as I hope to make it appear, he is out, in this (I must confess, not uncommon) Imputation on us and our Doctrine.

Why are we *Idolaters*? Because you give the same Honour and Worship, to the Lord Christ; who is a mere Creature, in your Account: as unto God. So he saith p. 123. And.

And yet it is certain, we have wrote no Book, this seven Years; in which we have not been careful, to profess to all the World, that a *like* Honour or Worship (much less, *the same*) is not to be given to Christ: as to God. Do the Trinitarians think, they may devise a Religion for us; and then come up into their Pulpits, to declaim against the Schemes, that are purely of their own Invention?

But he will say perhaps, why; do you not *pray* to Christ? I answer, there are indeed some Unitarians, who *pray* to the Lord Christ; as that *Mediatory King*, who is (say they) appointed by God, to succour us in all our Straits and Wants. But they do not equal (hereby) the Lord Christ, to God: for they own, that his *Knowledge* either of our Wants or Prayers, is only by *Revelation from God*; and his *Power* by which he relieves us, is wholly of God's giving, and altogether depending on the good Pleasure of God. This is the utmost, that any of us have said: and who sees not, that we are far from equalling the Lord Christ, to God Almighty; and consequently, far from *Idolatry*?

The other Part of the Charge is, that we are *Polytheists*. Why *Polytheists*? His Grace answers; because you believe *one*, who is a God by *Nature*; and *another*, even the Lord Christ, who (according to you) is a God by *Office*. What, says his Grace, a God but of *Yesterday*; a *Creature-God*, a God by *mere Positive Institution*: can they see no Absurdity, in this; nothing that is contrary to Reason and Good Sense?

'Tis well; but now, after these warm Salutes of Rhetoric and Fancy: will he deny, positively and directly; that the Lord Christ is a God by *Representation* and *Office*? He saith, we are *Polytheists*, for affirming it; will he therefore venture to deny it? We say, that as *Moses* is called a *God*, (Exod. 7. 1.) and that by God himself; on the account of his *Mission to Pharaoh*, and to the Israelites. And as the Jewish Magistracy are called *Gods* (at

John 10. 34. 35.) by our Saviour himself: on the account of *their Office*; or because they represented the Authority of God, in Punishing the Wicked, in Defending the Good, and in Remunerating the Worthy. So also may Christ be called a *God*, by *Mission*, by *Representation*, and *Office*: because he was the *Sent* of God to all Nations; and because to him, as Man, our Opposers themselves confess it, *all Power is given both in Heaven and Earth*, with respect to the Church. Behold here the Polytheism, of which we are guilty: and I say it again, let his Grace give it us under his Hand; that the Lord Christ, as Man, is not a God in these *Senses*. But if he never will do it; nor any other Learned Man, of his Party: 'tis but just, they should withdraw (their untrue and causeless) *Reproaches*.

The third and fourth Sermons of his Grace, are concerning the (pretended) Incarnation; or that God the Son was so incarnate in the Man Christ Jesus, that the Humanity and the Divinity were no longer two Persons, but one Person. He takes notice of some Objections, advanced by the Unitarians, against this Doctrine; the Objections are these. 1. That 'tis *Impossible*. It implies a manifold impossibility, that God and a *Man* (or any two other Intelligent Beings) should become one Person; without the Abolition of one of the Persons. 2. 'Tis *Incongruous*. Because 'tis unworthy of the Majesty of God; to become one Person, with so low a Creature as Man is. 3. 'Tis *Unnecessary*; as 'tis Unfutable, and Impossible. For our very Opposers confess, his Grace confesses it; that God might have given the same Laws to Mankind, and have called us to Repentance and Reformation: without taking such a (strange surprising) Way, as this of Assuming our Nature, and becoming himself a *Man*. All that was to be done, might have been done by the Ministry of a *Prophet*, furnished with a Power of Miracles; to confirm his Message

and Doctrine: as perfectly, and with more Dignity, than by God's laying aside his Majesty, and changing himself into a Man. These are the Objections; not all that we make, but that his Grace takes notice of: his Answers to 'em, are such, as his Cause affords.

*First*, To the first Objection, he saith; the Incarnation ought not to be called impossible: because we have an Instance or Example of it, in Nature; even the Union of the Soul with the Body. It is, saith he, every whit as possible with God; as unite himself to a Humane Nature: as 'tis for the Soul to be united to the Body. He says no more, on this Difficulty: therefore we must. We desire to be answered, to these Two Exceptions.

1. In the *Personal Union* of a Soul with a Body; the Union is between two *Finite* and *Commensurate* Things: which is not only possible, but very conceivable. But in the (pretended) *Personal Union* of God to Man, and Man to God; the Union is between *Finite* and *Infinite*: which cannot be imagined, without admitting one of these two things. *Either* that *Finite* and *Infinite* are *Commensurate*; that is to say equal: which every one knows, is false. Or that the *Finite* is united, but only to some part of the *Infinite*; and is disjoined from the rest of it: which all *Trinitarians* deny and abhor; because if so, Jesus Christ should not be Perfect God, but only God in part.

2. The Union of Soul and Body, may be *Personal*; that is, may constitute or make out a *Person*: because 'tis not the Union of two Persons; but only of one Person (even the Soul) to a Thing which is otherwise without Life, Reason, Memory, or Free-will. The Body is but as the Garment of the Soul; and is wholly acted by it, and depending on it. But in the (pretended) Union of God with Man; there are two distinct and very different Lives, Reasons, Memo-

ries, and Free-wills: which utterly destroys the Notion of a *Personal Union*. For a *Personal Union* supposes but one Life, one Reason, one Memory, one Free-will: because if these things which constitute a *Person*, are found more than once; there is no longer one Person, but two; and consequently no *Personal Union*, in the Sense in which we are arguing.

His Grace has not thought fit, to take any notice; that he knew of these Exceptions: I cannot but esteem his Prudence. For no Man has yet (in so many Ages) attempted, to answer to either of them; but he has run himself into *Errors*. It may be worth the Reader's while, to take account; how unfortunate, our Opposers have been, in their (vain) Endeavours to assail these two Difficulties.

(1.) About the Year of Christ 370, *Apollinaris* of Laodicea, a Man (saith Dr. Cress, *Hist. Litt.*) *Extra controversiam* *Dissimulans*, finding the Church's Doctrine of the Incarnation hazarded by this Objection; that two intelligent Natures must needs be two Persons, because two Understandings do certainly make two Persons, and can never be united without the Abolition of one of them: therefore he said, that the Lord Christ had no Soul, at least no Humane Understanding, but only a Humane Body; of which Body the WORD (or God the Son) was as it were the Soul and Mind. This was a dextrous Answer, and at first generally received and applauded. But after a while, the Unitarians urging the Words of our Saviour; *Father, into thy Hands I commend my Spirit*: and the next Words added by the Evangelist, *having so said, he gave up the Ghost*; Luke 23. 46. John 19. 30. and divers such like. I say, these Texts being objected, by the Unitarians: the Trinitarians were constrained to forgo this Answer, and to condemn the *Apollinarianism* of *Arius*, which was done in several Councils.

(2.) A-

(2.) About the Year 428, *Nestorius* a Monk and Priest of *Antioch*, being very famous for his Elegant Compositions, and for his Eloquence in Preaching, was made Archbishop of *Constantinople*. He saw the Mistake of *Apollinarius*; but seeing also, that 'twas necessary, to rescue the Church's Doctrine, from the before-said Objections of the Unitarians: he said, the Lord Christ because of the Inhabiting Divinity, hath two Understandings, a Divine and Human; and therefore is two Persons, God and Man; not one Person only, or God-Man. Thus he avoided the Objection, that if the Lord Jesus had two Understandings and Wills, he must also be two Persons: for he granted, that the Lord Christ is most certainly two Persons, because he hath the distinct and proper Characters (two Understandings and Wills) of two Persons. To the other Objection, that Infinite cannot be incarnate in Finite; because they are not Commensurate; the Finite is not capable of the Infinite: He said, that God was not united Hypothetically or after the Manner of a Person, to the Man Christ Jesus; but only dwelt in him, by a more plentiful Effusion or Exertion of the Divine Presence and Attributes, than in former Prophets. This led him to say, that our Saviour ought to be called *Christ*; and not *God*. He denied, that he could call him a God, of whom it might be once said; that he was but a Month old, or a Day old: He thought it, very absurd to say; a God of a Month old, or of a Day old.

This Explication being (in effect) a giving up the Article, of the Incarnation; to the Paulinists and Photinians, that is to the Unitarians; was immediately opposed by divers of the greatest Bishops: and though *Nestorius* was favoured, by almost all the Eastern Bishops, especially by the more Learned; yet the other Party being strongest at Court, among the Eunuchs of the Palace and some Intriguing Ladies, he and his Doctrine were condemned as Hereti-

cal and Damnable, in the General Council of *Ephesus*, held (and directed by the Court) Anno 431.

The Adversaries of *Nestorius*, and the Opposers of his Doctrine, prevailed with the Court; to use him after a most Barbarous Manner. First, they deposed him; from his Dignity of Arch-bishop: then, they obtained a Rescript, to have him banish'd: then, changing their Minds; they got him thrust into a Monastery. But some saying, that the Monks began to be infected with his Doctrine; they procured him to be banish'd to *Oasis*, a Town of *Lybia*: but then judging that this Place, though scorch'd to nothing but Sand by the extreme Heats of the Sun in those Parts, too good for him; by a new Order they made him be sent, to another Borough of *Lybia*, an open Place, on the Confines upon the Barbarous Nations. The Design of this Order, was; that he might (possibly) fall into the Hands of the Barbarous: which accordingly fell out. For the Barbarians making an Incur-sion, over all that Part of the Province, seized the Borough; set Fire to it, and carried away the People into Captivity and Slavery; and among the rest, *Nestorius*. Upon this, the Clergy could not contain their Joy; they ran immediately into their Pulpits, to acquaint the People with the good News, that a Town was taken and burnt, and the Townsmen (but among them *Nestorius*) gone into Irrevocable Slavery. Now the Presents of Joy, went about; now the Wisdom of the *Orthodox*, who had Divinely foreseen, that this was the only Place where they might get rid of *Nestorius*, was duly magnified; now the Gratulatory Letters filled all the Mail, to *Constantinople*, to *Rome*, and *Alexandria*. But the mighty Re-joicing was dash'd; on a sudden: for the Barbarous, less barbarous than the *Orthodox*, seeing *Nestorius* Antient and a Gentleman, and hearing from the Prisoners that he was a Priest much esteemed by his own Party; they very generously gave him a Bag  
or

of Bread and Dates, and a Palfy, to return into his Country again. This Accident was a most heavy Mortification, to the Orthodox: but soon bethinking themselves; thō they could not spare a *single Soldier*, to defend the Country against an *expected Invasion*; they sent away *several Troops*, to look up *Nestorius*. He that never hid himself, was easily found; and they sent him to *Panopolis*. But from thence, by other Souldiers and a fresh Order, he was hurried to *Elphantina*: and before he could be brought thither, by another (spick and span) new Order, he is carried back to *Panopolis*. From *Panopolis* again, he is haled to another Town; and from thence to another. His Body, not able to bear so many *Faigues*; and his Mind, broken with so many *Despights* and *Cruelties*; at length gave way to Fate: and he expired, in a Place on the Borders of *Tithan*.

But Death it self did not deliver him, from the Malevolence of the *Orthodox Persecutors*: they gave out, that he died of an *unnatural Death*; but being asked, of what Death, every Man told his own Tale. Some said, his *blasphemous Tongue* was eaten out, by Worms that grew in it. Others said, he died like *Arian*; being lifted up into the Air, and then flung against the Ground, so that his Bowels (being broken with the Fall) departed from him. This was the End, of this Great Man; who, so unluckily to himself, undertook to expound the *Incarnation*, and so rescue it from the Imputation of *Aburd* and *Impossible*. Yex *Nestorius* fell, but little regretted, if at all, by Men of Probity, Learning and Moderation: for though he had *divers great Qualities*, he had one Fault, which both surmounts and implies all Faults; he was a most violent and fierce *Persecutor*, of all *Dissenters* from the Church, especially of the *Unitarians*. He procured Imperial Bescrises, for shutting up their Churches; for Depriving, Fining, and Banishing them. Therefore it was righteous with God, that he should die, as he had

lived; in Persecution. *Just and True are thy Ways, thou King of Saints.*

(3.) Another Expofitor, upon the Text of the *Incarnation*, was *Eutyches*; but a very little time after *Nestorius*. He said, the Lord Christ is but *one Person*, and but *one Nature*, hach but *one Understanding*, one Will, one Energy, one Life. How so, how can this be; if he is God, and a Man? *Eutyches* answered; the Humanity of Christ was wholly absorpt in his Divinity, it is lost, and is not: In a word, after the Union, the Lord Christ is wholly God, and not Man; the Body and Soul being changed into the Nature and Substance of the Divinity.

The greatest and hottest Opposers of *Nestorius*, fell in with this Explication of *Eutyches*: but it being found to be too absurd, and altogether uncrenable, they were forced to yield it up; so that in the Year 451, in the General Council of Chalcedon, *Eutyches* and his Explication were *anathematized*, as *heretical*.

After his Condemnation, *Eutyches* was used, much after the rate that *Nestorius* had been. But this barbarous Opposition to two such Men, by those who are for holding an Opinion, without caring whether it be *Right or Wrong*, succeeded very ill: And thō the Orthodox, as the strongest side always calls it self, triumph'd over the *Persons* of *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*; yet *these* carried away with them, at least one half of the Christian Churches. At this Day, the Christians in *Egypt* and *Ethiopia*, are all of them *Eutychians*: Those of *Afia*, *Syria*, *Perfia*, and (Oriental) *India*, are (almost) all *Nestorians*; the Seat of their Patriarch is *Babylon*.

(4.) One part of our Objection to the (pretended) *Incarnation*, is, that it must suppose Infinite and Finite to be *commensurate*: or else it must be said, that the Humanity of Christ is united but to some part of the Divinity, and is disjoined from the rest; which would make the Lord Christ to be  
God,



God, but only in part. The famous Reformer, Dr. M. Luther, has endeavoured to obviate this (destructive) Exception; by saying: that the Humanity of the Lord Christ, his Body as well as his Soul, by virtue of its Union with the Divinity, is Omnipresent; is in all Places, no less than the Divinity. But all other Parties of Christians, but the Lutherans, call this the *Ubiquitarian Heresy*.

His Grace therefore had reason, to overlook our Exceptions against the Possibility of the Incarnation. He knew well, they are not to be answered; but by such an Hypothesis or Enodation: as the Church formerly condemned of Heresy, either in *Apollinarism*, or in *Nestorianism*, or in *Eutychism*; or more lately in (the Great) *Luther*.

*Secondly*, Our next Exception to the Incarnation, is; that 'tis incongruous or unbecoming: because 'tis unworthy of the Majesty of God, to become one Person, with so low a Creature as Man is. His Grace answers; that "the lower, any Being. (be it never so high) condescends, in order to do good: "the Glory of his Goodness shines, so much "the brighter. This is an Answer, very worthy of a good Man; but I humbly put this Case, or make this Supposition.

If his Grace, by that just Interest he has in the Favour of their Majesties, should procure the Pardon of certain Malefactors; and to keep them for the Time to come from the like bad Courses, should obtain the Grant, of some honest and sufficient Employments, or Offices, for them. Would not this Care and Benignity be sufficient unless his Grace went himself to the Prison; put on such Rags as theirs; were loaded too with the like Irons and Bolts; delivered to them their Pardons, and Commissions, with his Hand, and his Knee put to the Ground; nay, and lay with them many Nights in the Place, even till he catch'd his Death with Nast and Cold? For my part, I do not think, that this would be a *Glorious Condescension*; no not in the Opinion of his

Grace himself: I will adventure to say, seeing there is no Danger that his Grace will ever do it; that such a Scene would have more of *Folly*, than of *Goodness*. And that his *Goodness* would not be a whit the less: if he sent for the Prisoners; chode them well, for their Crimes; made them to receive their Pardon, on their Knees; and then gave them such Counsel, as might best dispose them to a new Course of Life. This, in my poor Opinion, would be very congruous, and the other very ridiculous; and therefore much less to be supposed of God, than of a wise Man.

*Thirdly*, We contend, that the Incarnation was as little necessary, as 'tis possible or congruous. Our Opposers grant, his Grace grants it; that "the Gospel, and the Pardon of Sin, might have been offered to "Mankind by a Prophet, in the Name of "God: So that there was no apparent cogent Necessity, for the Incarnation of God himself; it must be allowed to be an unaccountable causeless Debasement of the Divine Majesty, that he should become a Man. But we are verily perswaded, that without a very extraordinary and indispensable Cause for it, the Wisdom of God would not stoop, to such a Humiliation: and seeing no such Cause is assigned, we crave leave, to believe; that God was always God; and always keeping his Supremacy, Dignity and Majesty, as well as his other Attributes.

His Grace acknowledges the very great Weight of this Objection: he spends therefore a whole Sermon, in finding out Shifts, to elude the Force of it. He saith, in short, that the Wisdom of God had several Aims, in this (very strange) way of effecting Man's Salvation: These in particular.

1. He gratified hereby our Inclination for *Mysteries*. For all Nations, he saith, always delighted in Mysteries; that is, (saith he) in Rites of Religion, that were to be kept secret.

2. Whereas Mankind always affected a visible Object of Worship, and a sensible Duty there-

therefore to take Men off, from false Objects; God himself vouchsafed, to appear in our Nature.

3. And as Sacrifices for Sin, and particularly *Human Sacrifices*, had long been used, and were esteemed necessary: to comply with this Notion of Mankind, God was pleased, once for all, to assume a Human Nature, and be himself the Expiation for the Sins of the World.

4. The Deifying of Worthy Men, was a general Practice: to take Men off, from this Idolatry; behold one in our Nature, exalted to the right Hand of the Majesty on High, to be worshipped both by Angels and Men.

5. The World was mightily bent on addressing their Prayers, not immediately to the Deity; but to Mediators between the Gods and them: In compliance with this common Apprehension; God appointed one in our Nature, to be our perpetual Advocate and Intercessor.

6. By being incarnate in our Nature, God has given us a perfect Example of Holiness and Obedience; and hath shown us, that he requires nothing of us, but what he himself performed, while he was among us.

7. Here also is an Expiation for Sin, very honourable to the Justice of God, and to the Authority of his Laws; and very essential also to discourage Sin. For tho' God forgave Sin, to us; yet he punish'd it, in the dearly Beloved of his Soul.

8. The Death and Resurrection of Christ, which could not have been without his Incarnation, are Demonstrations to all Mankind, of a blessed Immortality prepared for us after Death. Here is a great deal, but not so considerable, as to detain us long: and a great part of it, is not only *besides*, but *contrary* to his Grace's Purpose.

(1.) Whereas he saith, that Mankind always delighted in *Mysteries*; that is, in certain *Modes* of Religion, that were to be concealed from All, but those that were ini-

ciated in that Religion: therefore in the Incarnation, God gave them a *Mystery*; which for the greatness and wonderfulness of it, swallowed up all other Mysteries. When his Grace tells me, I shall know it; where the Consequence of this Arguing lies? The Question between us, is concerning *Mysteries*, that are so called, because it seems *impossible to understand*, how they should either be, or be true; as for Instance, this of the Incarnation: His Grace's Answer is, concerning Mysteries, that are so called, because they were *to be concealed*, from some particular Persons; from those that were not entered, into that Form of Religion. We speak of things, that are *mysterious to be understood*; His Answer is concerning things, that are *fit to be concealed, from Strangers*. In short, the Question is concerning the *East*; and the Answer and Solution is about the *West*. It had been to his Grace's Purpose, if he could have said; because Mankind always delighted in certain Doctrines and Beliefs, that were *not to be commonly divulged*, but only to qualified Persons: therefore God gave to us the Mystery of the Incarnation, to be kept secret from the (Unhallowed, Profane) Vulgar; and to be manifested, stated, and known, to Others that were more worthy. This had been an Accurate Reasoning.

(2.) For the other Congruities or Reasons, assigned by his Grace, for the Incarnation of God; one Answer both perfectly satisfies them All, and also turns them on that very Doctrine, on behalf of which they are urged. He saith, God was vouchsafed to take on him our Nature; to gratify the great Inclinations of Mankind, for a *sensible Deity*, and a *visible Object of Worship*; and to comply with that common, and general Notion; that Sin must be expiated by Sacrifice, nay, by a *Human Sacrifice*: and to take the Nations off, from Deifying worthy Men; to which they were very prone: and to encourage our Hopes and Faith, by giving us a *Known Mediator* with himself; a Mediator,

diator, who having been in our Circumstances, would *carfully* intercede for us: and to set us a perfect Example, of Holiness: And (lastly) to assure us, of a Resurrection from the Dead. He thinketh, these are sufficient Motives; why so good a Being, as God, should condescend to become a *Man*, and even to suffer and to die for us. But why has he overlook'd it, that these Considerations do not prove, that the Incarnation of God was expedient in the Age of *Augustus*; after the World had stood above Four thousand Years: but that it was requisite, that God should be incarnate from the first Creation of *Man*; or however, immediately after the *Fall*, and when Men first began to multiply on the Earth. These Reasons of his Grace for an Incarnation of God, were much more forcible in the Age of *Adam*, than of *Augustus*: for by so late an Incarnation as was the Age of *Augustus*, Almighty God could propound, only to reclaim *Men* from their Idolatries and Errors; but by being incarnate in the very Times of *Adam*, he had prevented (if these Reasons of his Grace have any Truth) the Idolatries, and Impieties of Four thousand Years; which is to say, of above two Thirds of Time. Why hath his Grace given such Reasons for the Incarnation, which (if they were true) serve only to prove; that God had *overseen*, or had *neglected*, for so many Ages, the true and only Expedient, for prevention of the principal Sins and Errors of Mankind?

And therefore, as I said at first; these (pretended) Reasons of his Grace, militate

against the Doctrine, that he would advance by them: If these are good Arguments, 'tis (morally) impossible; either that there was in the Age of *Augustus*, or that there ever shall be, an Incarnation, of God, in our Nature. For seeing these were much stronger Motives, why God should vouchsafe to be incarnate, in the first Ages of the World and of Mankind, than in the Age of *Augustus*, or any Time after that: it follows, that if those Motives did not dispose the *Lord of All* to become incarnate, in the first Ages of the World; much less could they dispose him thereto, after the greatest part of their Force and Persuasion was lost. If Almighty God did not judge it expedient, to be incarnate; at what time he might have wholly prevented all the Evils, mentioned in these Reasons of his Grace: he would not think it fit to be done; when (after Four thousand Years were elapsed) he could only reclaim Men, in some Measure, from the Sins and Errors in which they were actually engaged. I think, I may say; this is an accurate and just Reasoning: it being founded on this *Maxim of common Prudence*; that what was *most expedient* to be done at first, than afterwards, would have been done at first, if in very deed (as his Grace contends) it had been at all congruous or expedient to be done. How can we say, that the Wisdom of God *overlooked*, or *neglected*, and that too for so long Time, what was not only fit and congruous, but so highly also expedient, as his Grace pretends, that the Incarnation of God was?

## The C O N C L U S I O N.

I Have now finish'd, Sir, what I intended, and thought convenient to say, on the *Explication*, and *Defence*, of the Trinity and the Incarnation, by our Learned Opposers. I do not so little know the World,

as to expect that I have satisfied the Authors of them; much less, that they will acknowledge that they are satisfied: when Prepossession and Interest have taken hold, tho' of very good Men; it is a Miracle, if

- I -  
ever

ever they are loosed from those Bonds: Men must sit very loose from the World, from its Honours and Reproaches, as well as from its Awes and Bribes; they must be in Circumstances, or must have a Greatness of Mind, to despise the Glories and Shames, as well as the Profits and Terrors of the World; in a word, they must have chosen God, and the Honour of his Name, for their Portion and Design; or they can never either imbrace, or so much as see an inconvenient, or a dangerous Truth. Yet I hope these Papers may fall also into the Hands of Persons, that are in Circumstances, or of a Humour, not to value the Power or Anger of our Mother the Church: and to such, they may be serviceable; if Authority and Numbers do not as much sway with them, which is too often seen, as Prejudice and Interest do with Others. And I cannot doubt, that there is a very great number, who are absolutely free, from all (untoward, unhappy) Biases: and that are not at all, who, or how many have said it; but only regard, how *reasonably* it hath been said. To such as these, I chiefly intend this Collection of Observations; and to these, they may be useful towards convincing them of this first, and most necessary Article of the Christian Faith, that there neither is nor can be more than One, who is True God.

I reckon, a Man has lived in vain, that knows not his Maker and God; we were surely created, for this end chiefly, to know that God is, and that there is *none other but he*: If we miss of either of these Truths, by Atheism, or by Polytheism; we have missed the first Design of our Creation, and of that Talent of Reason, which is the Character and the Glory of the Humane Nature. It is this Reflection, taking in therewith the Honour and Glory of God; that occasions the Opposition, that we (so unwillingly) make to the Doctrines of the Church, concerning Almighty God, and the Person of our Saviour. But we think, that we owe this Service to God

our Maker; and this Kindness, to the other Denominations of Christians; to rescue the Article of the Unity of God, from those Blinds and Misrepresentations, by which in very deed it is wholly subverted and abolished.

Those that oppose themselves, to this Design of ours, go All of them under the general Name of *Trinitarians*: But it is as the Birds of the Air, and the Fish of the Sea, may come under one common Appellation, of *living Creatures*, or some such-like. For in declaring their Faith, they are as contrary to one another, as are as much of another *Sort and Kind*; as the Inhabitants of the Air, and Waters, are divers in their Kinds and Qualities. By what hath been said in these present Papers, it appears, that they no more agree in their Faith, with one another, than even with us.

They are divided, first; into *Real Trinitarians*, and *Nominal Trinitarians*.

The *Nominal Trinitarians*, or *Trinitarians* in name only, are such as say; the Trinity of Divine Persons are only three *Attributes* of God, even his Wisdom, Power and Goodness: or the three Persons are *three Relations* of God, to his Creatures; he is their Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier: or they are *three Internal Properties*, that is to say, the Divine Substance is considered as unbegotten, and begotten, and proceeding; yet-so, as that there is but *one* Understanding, Will, and Power in God: or they are *three Modes*, that is, *three* such Distinctions in a Spiritual Being; as *three Possessors* (or such like) would be in a Man. All these (Nominal) Trinitarians hold, as the Unitarians do; that there is but *one* (Numerical) Divine Substance, or Nature, and therein but *one* (Numerical) Understanding, Will, and Power, but *one* Wisdom, Goodness, and Justice: in short, they hold not a Trinity of *Real or Subsisting* Persons; but only of such Persons, as none but themselves ever called Persons. For Attributes, Relations, Properties, Modes, were never reckoned either Persons or Personalities; but only by this Tribe: who have ridiculously

cautiously given the name of Persons, to the Qualifications of Persons. When these oppose the Unitarians, 'tis only to save, or improve, their Stake in the present World; they are really as much Unitarians, as we are: with them, God is no other ways *three* Persons, than as every *Angel* and every *Man* is three Persons; for every Angel and Man hath one (Numerical) Substance, and in this Substance *three* (or more) Attributes, Properties, Relations, and Postures. In short, the Nominal Trinitarians differ from us, only in this; that they use the *Terms* of the Orthodox, in an Unitarian Sense. If all Awe and Bribes were removed; the Nominal Trinitarians would forthwith *profess*, to believe as we do. And in the mean time, though they dare not say it; unless it be here and there an heretical Dr. *S—th*: they reckon, as much as we do; that all the Real Trinitarians are Tricheists, and Pagans. As on the other hand; the Real Trinitarians, who have Courage enough to speak out, such as Dr. *Sherlock* and Mr. *H—w*, account of the Nominal Trinitarians, as Apostates from the Doctrine of the Catholic Church: and (in a word) that they are no better, or other than meer Unitarians. If this Difference among 'em, should break out into a Contention; it would be a doubtful Point, which Party of 'em must be called the Catholic Church. For though Dr. *Wallis*, and those that are for a Trinity of Attributes, or of Properties, would be all slung out: yet Dr. *S—th* and his *Dulcinea* (though really she is the coarsest Mistress of 'em all) have a Party among the Learned, which is so mighty; that they would (at least) endanger their Opposers. They might (perhaps) be cast, among the meer Populacy, by the Poll: but they would (assuredly) carry it, among the Generality of Persons of Learning and Dignity; who are always able to govern the rest.

The Real Trinitarians are such as, the Bishop of *Gl. Mr. H—w*; Dr. *Sherlock*. These are Real Trinitarians, not only in opposition to the Nominal Trinitarians; and to the Unitarians: but also to the Arians; and to those

who (more or less) Arianize, such as Dr. *Cadworth*. These Real Trinitarians say; that by Persons, they mean *Persons according to the common Acceptation of the Word*, as his Grace expresses it: they believe, that Father, Son, and Spirit are as Real, as Subsisting, and distinct Persons; as *three* Angels, or *three* Men are. They do not believe but one (Numerical) Substance in God; but only one Substance, which is therefore called *our Substance*, because the particular Substances of the *three* Divine Persons are *out in Nature and Properties*: that is, each of them hath the same Divine Properties, that the other two have. They less believe, that the *three* Persons have but one Understanding, Will, and Energy in Number: for they think, each Person hath his own *Personal* Understanding, Will, and Energy; the Reason is, because other ways he could not be a Person, and God should be but one Person, not three: — This is plain Dealing; but 'tis also plain Tricheism. The Divines and Councils of the Middle Ages, would have condemned it as Heresy; and judged it to be a Revival of Paganism. When I say the *Councils*; I mean the Greek Councils, as well as the Latin: as I shall prove as large; if a Learned Person, worthy of one's Pains, shall undertake the Answer of these Papers.

But the Real Trinitarians are again divided, among themselves. Some of them believe the Trinity, with all its hard Things; or if you will, its Contradictions. And their Buckler, against all Opposition, is; it is a *Mystery*: and there may be, say they, such *Mysteries*; against which there lay such *Difficulties*, as amount to a *Demonstration* against them. This (evidently) is the Opinion, of my Lords of *Salisbury*, and *Worcester*; and many others. But this being an Opinion, that destroys at once all *Science*; and confounds *True*, and *False*, together: therefore others are for holding the Trinity, with some such Explanation, as may make it possible, and Sense. Such are the Bishop of *Gl. Mr. H—w*; Dr. *Sherlock*, Dr. *Cadworth*: these are for believing as Men, not as Children; they believe with their Reasons.



Reasons, nor by renouncing their Understandings, and thereby the very Human Nature. Of the former of these, there is no hope: because whatever you object; their Answer, is *Not*; or *Mystery*. But of the other, there is a Possibility, and a Likelihood too; that they may be informed: because they are *Sons of Reason*; we may say of em, *they are not far from the Kingdom of God*. To these last, I will put two Questions; and with them conclude, for the present.

Q. V. Whether an infinitely Wise, Powerful, and Good Person, be not as sufficient to all Purposes and intents; as *three*, or even *three* distinct such Persons? Is not the Father (the Father) alone able to make the World; and are not his *Personal* Perfections sufficient, to exertain and to make him (perfectly) happy? But if so; can there be any *Person* and *essence* in the Divinity? If philosophers have rightly observed, that *nothing* has its being in *vain*; is it reasonable, we is it plain, to suppose two distinct Persons in the Divine *essence* and *Nature*? Q. VI. But if these Divine Persons are *not* *say*, as some of them choose to say; toward

Completing the Nature and Notion of God; would not such such Persons be a more *complex* God; than *one*? Because if *three* Divine Persons make a more Perfect God; than *one*; by a Parity of Reason, it must be said; *seven* must constitute a more *complex* God; than *three*. But if so; their Trinity (or Three Divine Persons) is not a *most* *Complex*, or *absolutely* *Perfect* God. So ere it is that Reason, and the Divine Nature is self, as well as the Revelations of H. Scripture, affords most convincing Evidences; that *it is impossible* there should be *more* than *one* Divine Person, and that there can be no *distinct* Persons *but* in *Unity*.

S. I. R. These are the further Observations, that I have to present by me; on the Explications and Defence, of the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, published by our Opposers. If you publish them, I have it you to make such Corrections, or Additions; as may render them more worthy of Acceptance among the Learned, and Christian.

Sept. 29. 1694. I am your Assured.

F I N I S.

### BOOKS lately printed for the Unitarians.

- B**rief History of the Unitarians, in Four Letters. Second Edition.  
 Defence of the Brief History, against Dr. Sherlock.  
 The Acts of Athanasius, with Notes on his Creed; and Observations on Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Blessed Trinity.  
 Some Thoughts on Dr. Sherlock's Vindication.  
 Letter of Resolution concerning the Trinity.  
 The Trinitarian Scheme of Religion, with Notes thereupon: which Notes contain the Unitarian Scheme.  
 Observations on Four Letters of Dr. J. Wallis.  
 Accurate Examination of the principal Texts, alleged for the Doctrines of the Divinity of our Saviour, and the Satisfaction. In answer to Mr. Ashmole.  
 Reflections on Two Discourses by Master Lamb, concerning the Divinity of our Saviour.  
 Considerations on the Explications of the Trinity by Dr. Wallis, Dr. Sherlock, Dr. S—th, Dr. Cadwath, and Mr. H—th.